

---

# Imprimatur,

Liber cui Titulus, [ *An Answer to the Representer's Reflections upon the View of the Controversie, with a Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.* ]

Jan. 21. 1687.

*H. Maurice, R<sup>mo</sup>. in Christo*  
*P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep.*  
*Cant. a Sacris.*

---

---

# Imprimatur,

Liber cui Titulus, [ *An Answer to the Representer's Reflections upon the View of the Controversie, with a Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.* ]

Jan. 21. 1687.

*H. Maurice, R<sup>mo</sup>. in Christo*  
*P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep.*  
*Cant. a Sacris.*

---



d He

AN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
REPRESENTER'S REFLECTIONS  
UPON THE  
STATE and VIEW  
OF THE  
CONTROVERSY.

With a REPLY to the  
*VINDICATOR's full Answer;*  
SHEWING,

That the Vindicator has utterly Ruined the  
New Design of *Expounding* and *Representing* POPERY.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Ric. Chilwell*, at the *Rose and Crown* in  
*St. Paul's Church-Yard*. MDCLXXXVIII.



---

# THE P R E F A C E.

**I** Have here brought together the Representer and the Vindicator, two Friends that seem to have been great strangers to one another of late. They have been so busy each of them in pursuing his own Proper part, that they have had no eye to the safety of that design which is Common to both.

Nothing seems to require a more nice and exact care, then so to Expound and Represent the Roman Religion, as to gain Protestants, and yet not to hazard the very pretences to Infallibility in the Roman Church, and to Unity amongst themselves. And therefore, since these Two were engaged in this Work, they ought above all things to have proceeded by common Advice; and like Two even Squares, if it were possible, they should have touched one another in every Point.

But something or other has broken off this Correspondence: For the Vindicator has undone the Representer, if that Man can be undone by another, who had undone himself before. And betwixt 'em Both, there is a hopeful Cause lost, which can never be retrieved but by new Hands, or by a declared War between these two, in which the Representer, if he can, must undo the Vindicator.

If the Representer has a better Opinion of his own Affairs, he is a happy Man; For I dare almost undertake, that for the future no Body shall go about to disturb him, but he shall keep Possession in Peace.

I was for this time prevailed with to come in for one of his

## The Preface.

*Answerers.* He has shak'd off two or three already, and he is enough to tire out all the Controvertists in Town.

Te write against him is now grown as unprofitable a drudgery, as to plow upon a Rock, where there is no Soil to be turned up. He gives little or no occasion to write any thing that will answer the attention of a judicious Reader, and hardly of a curious one. He may be confuted indeed, and exposed as he deserves to be; but 'tis but a meer trial of skill, which no body is the better for. To Answer him now, will never pay the charge of a Book, and therefore he that undertakes it, must either leave him, as he was wont to serve his Adversaries, or be content with Pertinence where 'tis good for nothing.

This is the best Apology I have to make for those barren Pages which occur sometimes in the Answer to him. And if the Reader will accept it now, I pass my Word to need it no more. The Representer may from this time, either carry on the Character-Controversy upon his old Thirty seven Points, or he may think of some new Additions to patch up a Fourth Part out of his first Three, as he has compounded a Third out of his First and Second; and he may come out with Fifteen fresh Articles of Representation once a year as long as he lives, without any great fear of being opposed.

He may now write with a Privilege, and say what he pleases, if H. Hills will but give his consent; for I think no body else is like to discourage him. And if he puts out a Reply to this Answer, he shall do very well, but then I promise him he shall Answer it himself; and get the Victory by fighting the Battel on both sides,

The Vindicator is making all the haste he can after him. In truth the Representer came first to perfection, by nothing else but getting the start of him. For I have no skill at all, if the next Book that the Vindicator writes in this Controversy, does not make him a Privileged Author too.

\*

Indeed

## The Preface.

*Indeed if he should happen to be as good as his word, and try to Answer the Discourse of Extreme Unction, or fall upon some fresh Subject the next thing he does, he will be but an ordinary man so much the longer.*

*For when those men begin a Controversie, they write like other men, and so long 'tis possible to Answer them ; but they have such a way of carrying it on, as will wear out the patience of any man living. When their Arguments are spent without doing any execution, one would believe they must of necessity yield ; but they never appear invincible till then, and they bring such terrible Reserves, when they can Reason no longer, that the best we can do, is to make an honourable Retreat.*

*The Vindicator is much in the same state that the Representer was in, when his last Answerer plainly shewed him that he had dropt the whole Controversie, and lost his whole Cause : For the Vindicator, as I have shewn in the Reply, has lost the very same Cause another way ; if therefore he intends to be as famous as the Representer, I expect from him a Preface, or the like, containing Reflections upon my Reply to his Letter ; and if that happens, he may expect from me one Reply more, and after that, I promise him too, that, for me, he shall flourish all the days of his life.*

*It was the same ungrateful work to have to do with one of these Pieces, as with both ; and 'twas pity that more than one man should disoblige his hands about it ; and therefore when I had the Representer's Performance before me, I needed no Intreaty to tack the Vindicator's Full Answer to it ; in my Reply to which Answer I have shewn these men to one another ; and the Representer, I cannot but fancy, looks like a Chymist, that having laid out all he is worth in trying for the Philosophers Stone, is in the very nick of his unreasonable hopes, undone by an unlucky Friend, who comes in hastily, and by one moments meddling, confounds the whole Operation.*

*The*

## The Preface.

*The Representer had been setting up a good substantial Popery for Protestants to be fond of, which was to be found in the profession of Living men, with whom we may change a word, as occasion serves; but the Vindicator who was in with him in the same design, must needs show that he could help it forward by putting words together in less than a years time; and so the Popery they have been labouring for so long, is dwindled into a Church-sense, which 'tis in vain for men to expound one to another; he has made it an Invisible, unaccountable Popery, and something like a Spirit, that troubles the house all night, but nobody ever saw it.*

*This, I take it, must needs be a deadly disappointment to the Representer; and what if these two men should now serve one another, as they have served us? They are both of them like a pair of Diamonds, hard and sharp, and nothing can cut the one so handsomely as his Fellow.*

*If they should chance to fall foul, it would be indeed a Comical end of the Controversie, and not unsuitable to the Representer, who studied to make a Farce of it, when he brought in his Phanatick Sermon.*

*But let them make what end of it they please, there is a time when it is decent for us to give over, that as hitherto Truth has lost no ground for want of Argument, so it may lose no honour by want of Discretion.*

*I have given up the Representer, and shall but once more trouble the Vindicator, which will be more than enough for him, since ere long he may expect from his Antagonist such an Account of the Articles of the Bishop of Meaux, as will be esteemed by Judicious and Impartial men, a Final Determination of that Controversie.*

## The CONTENTS of the ANSWER to the REPRESENTER.

- H**IS Extravagance in diverting to the Case of the *Dissenters*. Page 1  
—And his Indiscretion in upbraiding us with their Sufferings. 5  
That the Discourse against *Transubstantiation* is not scurrilous. 9  
His Pretence that we have written against *Popery* without Success, is false, and impertinent if it were true. 10  
That the *Papists* are to thank the *Representer* for the Revival of these Controversies. 13  
That he now writes to praise himself, and what he had written before. 16  
—And presses upon us with meer Confidence, and tedious Repetitions. 21  
That he is a False *Representer*, because he has concealed one part of the Character of a *Papist*. 28  
The Folly of his Clamour, that we pretend to know what *Popery* is, better than the *Papists*. Page 29  
His Offer to receive us into the Church of *Rome*, upon the Terms which he propounds, considered. 31  
—That we cannot with a good Conscience accept his Offer. 32  
That if we could, he can give us no Security against *Old Popery*. 33  
That if he were able to secure us, we have no reason to think that he is willing. 34  
His Insincerity in telling us that he detests some Doctrines and Practices with which his Answerer charged the Church of *Rome*, and in refusing to say what they are in particular. 35  
The true meaning of these Offers to receive us upon the Profession of his *New Popery*. 38  
—And this exemplified by the Terms upon which the Converts of the City of  
B Orange

## THE CONTENTS.

<p><i>Orange</i> were reconciled to the Church of <i>Rome</i>. P. 39</p> <p>That he has abused Mr. <i>Montague</i>, by a False Representation of his Judgment concerning the Homilies of our Church. 45</p> <p>That he continues his Charge of Misrepresentation upon some of our Men, without replying to the Answers made in their Defence. 49</p> <p>— But makes bold to say,</p>	<p>that the Author of the <i>View</i> confessed what that Author clearly disproved. <span style="float: right;">Pag. 53</span></p> <p>His Pretence for declining a particular Answer to the <i>View</i>. 57</p> <p>His pleasant way of proving that he has not forsaken the Defence of his Double Characters. 58</p> <p>A brief Rehearsal of the <i>Presenter's</i> Performances. 66</p>
--	--

---

## The CONTENTS of the REPLY to the VINDICATOR.

<p><b>T</b>HAT the Apologies of the New Converts in <i>France</i> are a clear Evidence, both that the Distinction between <i>Old</i> Popery and <i>New</i> Popery is generally understood there, and that 'tis not a Distinction without a Difference. <span style="float: right;">Pag. 71</span></p> <p>That he strives in vain to shew the Case of <i>Monsieur Imbert</i> to be no Argument of such a Difference. 78</p> <p>That the <i>New</i> Popery is offered for the sake of the <i>Old</i> one. 82</p> <p>The <i>Good-Friday</i> Service of the <i>Missal</i> as to the Worship of the <i>Cross</i>, once</p>	<p>more explained. <span style="float: right;">Pag. 83</span></p> <p>How Matters stand between <i>Mr. de Meaux</i>, <i>Mr. Widenfelt</i>, and <i>Father Crasset</i>, as to the Worship of the <i>B. Virgin</i>. 85</p> <p>The <i>Vindicator's</i> Rule to know the Churches Sense in these things, by her <i>General Councils</i>, and by her <i>Universal Practice</i>, considered. 88</p> <p>That if there be another way to know the Churches Sense in Doctrines of Faith, besides her <i>Voice in General Councils</i>, and Two Poperies be made to appear that way, the <i>Vindicator</i> gets nothing</p>
---	---



## THE CONTENTS.

nothing by Councils. P. 90	sible Demonstration of <i>Two</i>
That if there be no other	<i>Poperies.</i> 106
way, yet even by this way	A final Defence of our Charge
it is demonstrated that they	against the Council of <i>Trent</i>
have <i>Two Poperies</i> amongst	about the Veneration of
them. 93	<i>Reliques.</i> 107
That the Vindicator has	Of Judging of the Churches
brought things to that pass,	Sense by her <i>Universal Pra-</i>
that he makes Councils as	<i>ctice.</i> 110
insignificant, as the Repre-	The Bishop of <i>Meaux's</i> argu-
senter has made the <i>Scrip-</i>	ing against the <i>Pagans</i> from
<i>tures</i> to be. 101	their Practices, shewn to
That to avoid <i>Two Poperies</i> ,	be good against the Church
he has in truth not left so	of <i>Rome.</i> 111
much as <i>One Popery</i> amongst	That the Vindicator has utter-
<i>Papists.</i> 105	ly ruined the <i>Representer's</i>
But after all, the ill Language	Designs; 113
we have from the Vindi-	—And at the same time
cator here, for not grant-	betraied the Bishop of
ing that his is the True <i>Po-</i>	<i>Meaux's</i> Exposition too. 118
<i>pery</i> ; and the ill Usage	Particular Replies to what
we should meet with else-	remains in his <i>Full Answer.</i>
where, for contending that	120
it is the True one, is a sen-	

The Court of  
Commons  
of the City of London  
do hereby certify that  
the within is a true and  
correct copy of the  
original as the same  
now lies on the table  
of the said Court.

In witness whereof  
the Clerk of the said  
Court hath hereunto  
set his hand and  
seal at the City of  
London this 10th day  
of June 1881.

John Smith  
Clerk of the Court

---

AN  
**A N S W E R**  
 TO THE  
 REPRESENTERS REFLECTIONS  
 UPON THE  
 STATE and VIEW  
 OF THE  
**CONTROVERSY.**

**H**IS first Reflection upon the *Stater*, is for Misrepresenting the case of the *Dissenters*. Had the *Stater* done so, the Representer had business enough of his own, to let them speak for themselves. But he had a better opinion of himself than so. *Hitherto*, says he, *I have been concerned with such who have most unjustly traduced* Pref. p. i. *and exposed the Doctrine and Faith of our Church, and now of late an upstart sort of Misrepresenter has called upon me, who pretends to give an account of the Present State, &c.* Which is just as if he had said, "Have not I for this "three years and upwards so mauld the *Traducers* and  
 C " *Exposers*

## An Answer to the Representer's Reflections

“*Exposers* of Papists, that they feel it to this very hour ?  
 “How then durst this upstart sort of *Misrepresenter* shew  
 “his head, as if there were not such a Man as I in the  
 “Nation ?

To this tune he begins, which is not seemly in a Man, whose Character requires more Humility and Modesty than this comes to: For I am told he is a *Reverend Father*, which makes me the more sorry for him.

I am resolved to be very Civil to the Representer; but as he has behaved himself, I am at a great loss how to express it. His falling upon the forementioned Author as a *Misrepresenter*, and the pretence upon which he does it too, is so very much out of the common Road of pertinence, that I know not what to do with him. It looks as if he had been a little unsettled with that overweening opinion I mentioned just now; and then that those words of *Representing* and *Misrepresenting* had rung in his Head so long, that while he is awake, he thinks of nothing but chastising *Misrepresenters*, and Dreams of it when he sleeps, and can find nothing but *Misrepresentation* in every Line of ours that he reads; and as if there were some cause to fear that he may happily forget every Name that he has, but that of a *Representer*; To pretend, as he does, that that Author had *not taken care to shew the State of the Controversy as it was*; and that he *intends* to make this *appear as far as concerns* the Representer; and then presently to fall upon the *Dissenter's* Case, is such a confusion of things, that there must be a disturbance in a Man's head to put them together. And 'tis still a worse sign, that he speaks of that Author's *calling upon him*: Now of late, says he, *an upstart sort of a Misrepresenter has called upon me*. For what should it be, but the working of his own Head, that made him fancy that Author *called upon him*, where I dare say, he never so  
 much

much as *thought* of him? For who would think that the *Representer* should be at all concerned for the true stating of matters that concerned the Dissenters?

It must be confessed that these are ill tokens, when they come thick upon one another; for some such disorder as I am speaking of, appears in the very first Line of his *Preface*; which is so much the more remarkable, because that which is uppermost usually comes first. *'Tis my fate*, says he, *always to have to do with Misrepresenters*. By which it should seem that this conceit is never out of his Head. If he does but touch a Book written by any of us, his Imagination presently transforms it into a *Misrepresenter*: And what is merely his own *Fancy*, viz. That he has *always to do with Misrepresenters*, he takes to be his *Fate*, as if he were destined to be the scourge of this sort of men. And so *The Present State of the Controversy* coming cross in his way, the Author of it seemed to him to be an *upstart sort of Misrepresenter*, as the Flock of Sheep seemed an Army of Giants to the wise *Don*, who also thought himself called upon to redress the wrongs that were done any where in the World.

But I will not peremptorily conclude what the Man aims; all this, it may be, is but design, and the Man has a serious meaning, tho' at first sight one would be apt to think that he is a little too much shattered to have any meaning at all. It may be said, that there is this pertinence in his matter, that it seems to serve a General end, viz. to do the Church of *England* a good turn, which he has been owing to her ever since he fell off to the Church of *Rome*; and this may be all the pertinence that he very much cares for; only because 'tis good to keep to a point, or at least to seem so to do, therefore when he has raked up a few more materials, he knows

## An Answer to the Representer's Reflections

how to dispose them under these words of *Misrepresenting* and *Representing*; and then out comes a Book. If it be thus, he was only to blame for streightning himself at first, and for promising long since that he would keep to his *Representing* Post. He should have called that Book of his which led the way to the rest, *The First Part of Miscellanies against the Church of England*. For this Title would have served him to have written Books *Part after Part* as long as he should live; And I think the pertinence of 'em would never have been questioned.

But what has the Author of the *Present State* said, to bring upon himself the charge of *Misrepresenting*? Why, it seems he made bold to say, that some of the Clergy of this City had written Cases for the satisfaction of the Dissenters in the *plainest and most inoffensive manner they could*. But where is the Misrepresentation? Was not the manner *plain and inoffensive*? Yes, says the Representer, as to the *Method and Stile in which those Tracts were penned*, for all as I know, there was *plain and inoffensive writing*. So that, for all as he knows, the *Matter* too might be as plain and inoffensive as the *Method and Stile* of those Books; for I perceive he never read them. What then can be the Misrepresentation? To be short, it lies in this, That the Dissenters were at that time urged with other *Persuasives, by Writ, by Summons, by Seising of Goods, &c.* Well, but did that Author deny this? No; but he did not mention it; and therefore *he did not represent the State of the Controversy between the Churches of England and of Rome, as it is, but as he would have it thought to be; viz.* because he did not at all Represent the state of the Dissenters with respect to the Laws, when the Divines wrote for their satisfaction. He that can hale and pull in things in this fashion, will never want matter; but to let that pass, and to wander along

Pref. p. 2.

P. 3.

P. 2.

along with him for a while, as every man is bound to do, that will keep him company; I cannot understand that it was that Author's Duty to make the least mention of the execution of the Laws upon the Dissenters, unless the *Representer* can prove, That because he either studies to be impertinent, or cannot help it, therefore we are all bound to be so too. The *Stater's* business was to give an account to his Friend how the Controversie stood between us and the Church of *Rome*; and he introduced his Matter by shewing, That the Divines having written some Discourses for the sake of the Dissenters, and that with good success, did then apply themselves to the Controversies with the *Romanists*: But because he did not enter upon an Enquiry whether the Laws had not more to do in this matter than the Discourses of the Divines, therefore the *Representer* talks of that Author's *imposing upon his Reader with poor shifts in a matter so well known; and that he must not pass for a true Stater of Controversie*, P. 3. *who thus tells the Story by halves*; so that unless we drag in matters that are nothing to the purpose, as he does, we tell *Stories by halves*; and no body will be ever able to *State Controversies* right, that cannot foresee what rambling thoughts will come into the *Representer's* head the next time he writes a Book: But since he is fallen upon this business, he may now please to observe, That neither the *Stater*, nor any of those Divines of whom he made mention, used any of those *Perswasives* of which the *Representer* speaks, but saved the Dissenters from them, as far as it consisted with their Duty, and were by some people called Names for their pains. But I perceive his trouble is, that the *Stater* should believe those Discourses had good Success: For, says the man, 'tis very probable that these sort of *Perswasives* sent more to the Church, than the Discourses; so that by what I remember of



P. 3.

of those times, had not the Church of England taken the *Lab* in hand as well as the *Pen*, the Churches had continued as empty as they are at this day: Our Representer plainly insinuates by the way, that our Churches are somewhat empty at this day; and this is the very man who upon the present occasion observes, That *altho dealing out of Relations by Tale and by Scraps might pass in a matter beyond our memory*, as of the Council of Trent, of Lateran, of Pope Gregory; yet to come thus with half Stories in a Concern of Yesterday; oh! that is not to be endured.

P. 4.

But whether our Churches are, as it were, empty, is without all doubt a Concern of to day; and for a man not to tell half-Stories of such a Concern, but whole Stories the quite contrary, What is that, I pray? That he thinks it probable that the Dissenters were more wrought upon by Sufferings than by the Discourses of the Divines, I easily grant; for he knows of a certain Church that has done more by those sort of *Perswasives*, than by all that ever was written in her behalf; as all Europe and both the Indies can bear her witness. Doubtless therefore he thinks it probable that our Church was a gainer by the execution of the Penal Laws at that time; but whether it was so or not, is another Question: I find that where he mends the *Staters* Account for him, he would have had him to say, That it was very likely (for such is the frailty of wicked man) that more were frightened and whipt to Church, than came thither by Force of our Reasoning and Discourses.

P. 4.

By the way, he should learn to be more grave and serious, than to make sport with the *Frailty of wicked man*; which is a thing that a good Priest ought to lament, and to remedy what he can, by his Doctrine and Example: When he has to do with his *Adversaries*, if he finds that any of them grows exceedingly impertinent, and when Argument forsakes them, fall

to



to *Ridiculing*, or that they use Tricks to cover their *Convictions*, and do but discover them so much the more, let him lay it on handsomly without sparing, if he likes this way of Correction best: But for a *Priest of the living God* to rally with the *Frailty of wicked man*, when he means nothing by it, but to help out a *Lampoon* upon a single Adversary whom he does not love, is very *unpriest-like*, and a more likely way to make *Atheists*, than to mend that which he, it seems, can make merry withal, *the Frailty of wicked man*.

Well: But 'tis not so certain, that when the *Dissenters* were under the execution of the Laws, that then, I say, human *Frailty* wrought that way which he speaks of; for it might work the quite contrary way; and the Orders for that purpose coming from above much about the same time, the offence which they took at that, might prejudice many of them against all that the Divines could say, tho the Divines had no hand in it; for mankind is apt to be provoked, as well as to be frightened; and to act inconsiderately in one, as well as in the other case.

But there is this Reason to think that they were rather the *Discourses* than the *Penalties*, which filled our Churches, That the *Prosecutions* have been at an end a good while; and 'tis therefore to be hoped that the virtue of the *Discourses* did the good work at first, and goes on to do it still; for whatever the *Representer* fancies, the Churches are as full *at this day*, as they were in those *times*, when he pretends the Church of *England* took the *Lasb* in hand: They are so full, that a Reverend Father may come to spy and hearken, and think to escape in the Throng without being observed; and what if the *Representer* has been upon this Mission himself? Then, I say, he shall Represent for those that will trust him; but for

me and my Friends, never whilst he breathes.

P. 2.

As for his Story of one Mr. *de Laune*, I know nothing of it. The *Representer* says he wrote a Book, and was sent to the *Compter*; but he does not say it was *for writing that Book*; tho he would insinuate some such matter; from which modesty of his, if there be any truth at all in the story, one might venture to conclude, that he knew the man was sent to Prison for something else. And yet if he were sent to Prison for the writing of that Book, but if neither that Divine whom he wrote against nor any of the rest, contributed to it so much as by a wish, the *Representer* stings us not by this *Reflection*. Of this I have told him something of my own knowledge already.

P. 3.

For what he says of some that were *starved*, and of *Orphans* and *Widows* that were *made so* by the Penalties inflicted upon the Dissenters, it is to be hoped that our *Representer* over-does the business, and rants somewhat too Tragically: For my part, I have always thought that the use of those *Perswasives* which he talks of, does at the long run, more mischief to a Church than good; and if I may speak my own experience, I do not find this Spirit of Moderation to prevail any where so much as in the Church of *England*. But the *Representer* brings over the Sufferings of *Dissenters* for nothing else but to prejudice them against us. I will not here enter into an Enquiry what reason there is for it; but this one thing I will say, That I am no less desirous than himself, that the Dissenters should be very often told of their Sufferings in those times; only if a man will be telling them, then as the *Representer* says, it would do well not to *tell the Story by halves*; but if he does, then (to return him some of his own words) I do not think, that *with all his poor shifts, his Readers will be imposed upon in a matter*

P. 3.

matter so well known. And therefore I, no less than the *Representer*, desire that the *Dissenters* would think of all that is past, as long as they have a day to live.

As to the *Tracts* that were soon after written against the *Papists*, the *Representer* observes that Two things were not mentioned by the *Stater* upon this occasion, which we had upon the former; Not the *Plain and Inoffensive manner* of Writing; nor any *News of Success* which these *Discourses* had upon the *Parties* designed.

For the former he says, That the *Stater* was too conscious of the scurrilous and bitter Spirit with which some of them were penned; that one against *Transubstantiation* being Instance enough. By which he would insinuate, that others of them too were written in the same manner: How hard is it for some men to be sincere in any thing! I remember indeed some of these Expressions in that Discourse which he produces, such as *Impudence*, *Nonsense*, *Monstrous Stupidity*, and the like. But I would know of the *Representer*, whether there can be any just occasion for letting these words loose; and to the Sense and Reason of Mankind I may appeal, if there can be an occasion more just than this; for 'tis impossible we should have greater Evidence that any thing is true, than we have that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is false; and then I may ask the *Representer*, whether it be not the greatest abuse that ever was put upon mankind? This Argument therefore would bear a little more quickness than was thought convenient for the handling of the rest: But here lies the sting of the *Representer's* Charge, That *Transubstantiation* is a Subject in which so many Learned and Virtuous Men of the Christian World are nearly concerned: To which I answer, That 'tis so much the worse for the *Christian World*, but not for the Author of that Discourse: For if indeed *Learned Men*,

D

and

and *Virtuous* Men, espouse such a Monstrous Doctrine as that of *Transubstantiation*, there is not less but greater cause to *exclaim* both against them and it : If the *Representer* thought that the *Learning* and *Virtue* of the *Men* should have gained some more reverence for the *Cause*, than that Author had for it, he may think so still for me ; I will not go about to question the *Learning* and the *Virtue* of many that hold *Transubstantiation*, but 'tis *Transubstantiation* still : I think it is no question but there were many *Learned* and *Virtuous* men in *Egypt* who were nearly concerned in the business of making Gods of Things that grew in their Gardens, and yet he had not been too blame that should have said it was *Impudence*, *Nonsense*, and *Monstrous Stupidity*, to Worship, and to teach others to Worship *Leeks* and *Onyons*.

P. 5.

Now for the Second Observation, That we have no news of any Success those Discourses had upon the parties designed. I say, if they had indeed no Success, the *Starter* was the honestest man not to say they had any; tho he scaped here very well, that he was not made a *Misrepresenter* for not confessing that they had none. But upon this occasion the *Representer* is very angry : It could not, says he, be rationally expected that those who ———— chose rather to forgo all the interest and convenience of humane life, than join with a *Schismatick* Congregation, should be afterwards brought to Church by a few empty Discourses, which making no more Converts than they deserved, made, as I can hear of, none at all : But why *Schismatick* Congregation, and a few empty Discourses ? When men keep what their Adversaries would get from them, and when they have disappointed all their designs, they use to be pleased, and in good humour; and tho perhaps they may laugh heartily at their *Antagonists* for losing their pains, yet 'tis not so natural to rage against them, as if themselves were the

\*

Losers :

upon the State and View of the Controversy.

11

*Insers* : I begin therefore to suspect that our *Representer* knows of some *Success* those *Discourses* had, which he is not willing to own. But be that as it will ; as we did not think the better of the former Performances, for their having had some Success, so neither should we think the worse of these if they have had none, which may perhaps be imputed to the prejudice of the persons for whose good they were designed, rather than to the pretended *Emptiness* of the *Discourses* themselves ; unless the *Representer's* word may be more securely relied upon for *Empty Discourses* now, than for *Empty Churches* before : We are sorry that is proves so difficult a matter to recover these men ; yet 'tis some Consolation to us that we have lost so very few out of so great a body as the Communion of the Church of *England* makes : And therefore if *Discourses* are to be judged of by their Success, the *Representer*, and such as he, should have a care of *boasting* at this time of day. Our design was not only to recover those that are deceived, but likewise to keep those from Error that are in the way of Truth ; and therefore it may be reasonably presumed, that our endeavours have had good Success upon the greatest part of those whom they were designed to serve, tho not upon all.

But when I have told this man what perhaps himself knows, that by these *Discourses* we have gained some from Popery to the Reformed Religion ; I will also tell him, that if we had never gained so much as one, it had been no disparagement to our *Arguments*, since they have ways of fixing their Profelytes, which we abhor ; of which I shall give this one Instance : It is their *Rule* ( let others judge whether it be their *Practice* ) to require a dreadful Oath of all whom they can gain, not to be prevailed withal *Quocunque Argumento*, by any *Argument*,

to forsake the Communion of the *Roman See* ; This Oath is to be seen in the *Pontifical* under the Title of *Ordo ad Reconciandum Apostatam, Hæreticum aut Schismaticum* ; and if the *Representer* be importunate, he shall have it next time at length : To doubt only of any Point which the Church of *Rome* teaches , is a sin that must come under Confession, by which the Priest is sure to have notice when the Spirit of Truth begins to work ; and upon signal given, to extinguish the first Motions of it : We have a hard Task, who are not only to oppose Reasons to Reasons, and to the common prejudices of men, but to produce Reason against particular Engagements and Oaths never to hearken to any Reason at all.

The *Representer* gives out himself to be a Convert, and may therefore be presumed not to be ignorant of these things, but to be himself intangled by an Oath to be moved by no *Argument whatsoever*, to return to this *Schismatick Congregation*, as he calls it ; and therefore in him it was great forgetfulness to ascribe the Steadiness of the English *Romanists* to nothing else but a *Christian Resolution*, when he could not but know of some other Engagements that are amongst them, which are not altogether so *Christian* : Which I had not observed here, if his Severity to the *Stater* had not led me to it ; for it was but the very Page before, in which he set upon him with all his Eloquence for imputing the *fulness* of our Congregations to the Reasonings of the Divines, without mentioning the execution of the Laws. If I had been a *Representer*, that Page, I think, would have kept me in some awe, and hindred me from doing that in the very next, which he calls *telling Stories by halves*.



As for the *most cruel persecution*, which, as he says, those of his Communion suffered lately, for *not joyning with our Schismatick Congregation*, he describes it so terribly, and assigns the Cause of it as positively, as if this was a *matter beyond our memory*, which he knows it is not. But when a Man has a mind to exercise his Stile, one Subject may serve him as well as another.

But to return to the *Present State*; the Author of it either made but very small faults in drawing it up, or he is very much obliged to the *Representer* for letting the great ones pass. His next quarrel with the *Stater* is, for making the *Roman* party the Aggressors; and the *Papist* *Misrepresented*, &c. the beginning of this Book-War. p. 6. For this Man will have the Onset to have been given by Dr. *Sherlock*, in his Sermon before the House of Commons, which was published as near as I can learn, about Two Months before the *Representer* came forth. The Author of the *Agreement*, &c. concurs with him in this Objection, as he does in *Humour* to admiration, tho' they have their several ways: For one of them proves that we are *Agreed* with the Church of *Rome*, and the other that we *Misrepresent* the same Church, and yet so like one another, as if the same Planet govern'd them both. But, as to the Doctor's Sermon, I do acknowledge that there was one passage in it that grated upon the *Papists*. And I have two things to say to it: First, the *Stater* assures me that he did not think of that Sermon at all, when he was at work, and could therefore have no design in omitting it; but withal, now that he is told of it, he cannot grant that a single Reflection in a Sermon, that was afterwards Printed at the desire of the *House*, ought to be esteemed the beginning or the occasion of those Controversies. And he believes, that if we had published such a like Book for this Church, as  
the

State, p. 4.

the *Representer* did for his Party, and one of their Sermons had been not long before published by *Command* with a like Reflection upon us, they would for all that have thought us to be the Aggressors. He says farther, that he spake only of Discourses that professedly treated of these Controversies; and therefore that if he had thought of that Sermon, he thinks it was not his Duty to take notice of it; and he wonders that the *Representer* should be so overset with a Cavilling humour, as not to observe those words; that from the *Death of our late Royal Sovereign*, our Divines thought fit to be of the *Defensive side*, and for some time published no more *DISCOURSES OF THAT KIND*, but waited to see, &c. In the next place I must tell the *Representer* my thoughts, and leave others to judge of them as they see cause. I say then, that the *Representer* published indeed his Book about two Months after the Sermon; but, if the Truth could be known, I would venture all that little I am worth, that the *Representer* had been hammering out that Book some Months before that Sermon was made. For not to insist upon it, that he has taken more time to write Books that are a great deal worse; for perhaps he was otherwise employed, or gave himself some convenient Relaxation: This, I believe, all considering persons will grant me, that to represent *Popery* in a kind of *Protestant* dress, is so nice, and withal so dangerous, tho' now, it seems, so necessary an undertaking, that no performance can require greater Art and Application of mind. Between the danger of giving up a point, which the Church must not quit under the penalty of forfeiting her *Infallibility*, and the danger of guarding it too plainly to the offence of *Protestants*, the Undertaker is obliged to have his Eyes about him, and to look on every side. Every expression must be exactly weighed: It

will



will sometimes happen that but one will please, which will not be thought of till many others are tried and rejected: Sometimes again, when the first of all is not liked, after the rejecting of many others that are found more liable to exception, the first must be taken with all its faults. So that here will be much altering, and some restoring, and not a little fining and superfining: And when one Man has done what he can, one Man's judgment in a Cause so perillous is not to be trusted; It must be revised by others; and because faults will come in one upon the neck of another, where every place is a place to let them in, it must be revised again and again; as the Bishop of *Condom* can tell this Man, if he needs that any body should tell him. Now, tho' the *Papist Misrepresented and Represented* does not rise up to the Spirit, and the Art of the *Exposition of the Catholick Faith*; yet considering the untractableness of the Matter, it was no ill-wrought piece of work; and excepting that blunder of his, that when he was a *Protestant*, he believed the *Sermons* of the *Papists* to be in an unknown Tongue, as well as their *Prayers*, and two or three less considerable misfortunes, it was conveniently contrived for its end, which was to amuse less thinking people. In a word, it appears to be a work of so much labour and time, that I believe few will question, but tho' the Doctor's *Sermon* was first rigg'd out, yet the *Papist Misrepresented and Represented* was upon the Stocks a good while before. And then the *Representer's* Conscience should have forbidden him to find fault with the *Stater*, for intimating that the Gentlemen of the *Roman* Communion were first guilty of breaking the Peace. This I think is enough in return to a small exception; but whether it be or not, the *Stater* is resolved to put himself upon the mercy of the World for the future, rather

rather than he will run out into any more Apologies upon so slender an occasion.

P. 7.

To proceed; it was said in the *Present State*, that we were surprised to find no notice taken of the former Tracts against Popery, in the *Representer's* first Book. This he turns well enough, confessing that *it must needs be a matter of surprize*, That the Papists now enjoying the *Royal Favour*, should after so many provocations, be contented to make no other return, than in a short, moderate and peaceable Tract, to give an account of their Faith and Doctrine, &c. And so he takes occasion to praise their *Meekness and Charity*.

To all which it might be enough to say, that so long as it does no body any hurt, other men may be safely allowed to commend themselves; and let them consider whether it will do them any good: But that if it were not more difficult to Answer some Books, than to give a Reason for not Answering them, in all likelihood we had heard the Victories of these Writers more celebrated at this time, than their *Meekness and Charity*.

View. p. 65.

But whereas he magnifies the Good Spirit of his short, moderate and peaceable Tract, upon this score, That there was no upbraiding the Church of England Divines in it, notwithstanding *Abusive Reflections*, &c. he does in effect confess of the first, what was proved of all his Books but the first, That the Church of England Divines were intended in them, as we were very sure that they were. He has for some time lost that wariness, which such a *Representer* as he sets up for, should be always provided with. Well; but however the Tract was moderate and peaceable, without any severe Word or Expression in it, or any upbraiding of the Church of England Divines of the mischiefs they suffered from their hands. Now indeed, the Tract does not call them Knaves and Villains, but only

only insinuates from one end to the other, that they had abused the people, and made them believe that the Church of *Rome* owns those things which she utterly disowns. Which how *Moderate* and *Peaceable* a Charge it was, I might almost appeal to himself, or to the *Agreement-maker*, when I have put him in mind, that what he at first called *Misrepresentation*, after his anger had made him speak out, he bluntly calls *Lying* and *Calumny*, and what not? Now this I acknowledg to be a *short*, but sure it is no *moderate* and *peaceable* way of managing Controversies: And this was some reason for wise men to be a little surprized at it. But this was not all: For there was no colour (whatever the *Representer* pretends) for neglecting those Tracts against Popery, and beginning a new Representation of it. For they proceeded upon the old and received Representations of Popery, and such as had been allowed by *Bellarmin*, *Becanus*, *Harding*, *Stapleton*, and all the renowned Champions of the *Popish* Church for an Age and half before us; whom this Man does by necessary consequence Arraign of Misrepresenting Popery, whilst he accuses our Divines of doing so; altho their Discourses went upon that state of the Fact which was agreed to by those old Disputers.

Had these Books been written in their days, we should have had no *Representations* in return to 'em, but down-right disputing upon the several points as they are stated there. For to give them their due, when our Divines came up to their own side of the Question, those Gentlemen came up to theirs, and maintain'd it as well as it could be maintain'd. But our Friend the *Representer* has taken another way, which is in *peaceable* and *moderate* terms to give us the Lye, for calling that *Popery*, which we dispute *against*, and which they disputed for.

E

Having

*An Answer to the Representer's Reflections*

P. 7.

Having thus commended *Himself* and *Hu*, for their Meekness and Charity, it came presently in his mind to say something in praise of his Book, tho' it did not mention those Discourses: Which he says could be no surprise, but only to some half-witted men, who read things without understanding, and to whom plain sense is a Riddle, and not to any others, tho' but of moderate parts. And thus in pure kindness to his Book, he does in the first place take the size of our understandings by it; and from this time forward, whoever shall question the pertinence of his Book, must go for a half-witted man, and one that has not so much as moderate parts. So that our business is presently done; and then the Discourses are brought to the Test of the Book, as you shall hear. There was, says he, scarce any controversial Point, or Matter of moment in them, but what was spoke to, and opened in this one little Tract: And they must needs be in an evil condition, if there is scarce any Point of theirs but what was spoken to, and opened in so dangerous a Piece as that one little Tract. But it were well for 'em to scape so, if they might; For by and by the Stater is told, that if he will compare these Discourses with the Chapters of that Treatise, he may find them All there spoke to as to the substance, and something to spare. Now, if after scarce any point was omitted, the truth is, that All the Discourses were spoken to, and something to spare; then it is like to go very hard with 'em. All the comfort is, That the Discourses and the Points are as yet said to be but spoke to; For there are divers ways of speaking to things, and some of 'em harmless enough. And therefore now comes the killing stroke: The true Reason of the surprise was, that in so little room, and so plain a method, there was enough to ANSWER those Discourses. Nay, he affirms, that there was a Noise about it

P. 8.

*it throughout the Nation, not for Answering too little, but for Answering too much. So that the Discourses are gone beyond redemption, for there was enough to Answer them; and if that would not do, they were Answered too much: And which is more wonderful, there was enough to Answer, not only those Discourses, but a great part of the Books and Sermons that had ever been Writ or Preached against Catholicks; to which if he had but added, or that ever shall be Written or Preached against Catholicks; he had made an end of his work once for all, and his one little Tract had made a pretty Triumph over Ages past, present, and to come.*

Were I so happy as to grow upon an Adversary in the way of Reasoning, as this Man does in boasting and pressing forward with new and greater confidence; I should not yet take my self to be a match for him: For I now perceive that he carries such Invincible Force in his Face, that no modest man, tho' fortified with the Conscience of Honesty, and the Advantage of a Good-Cause, can always bear up against it, but must at length let his Countenance fall, and turn away from him.

As to every Article of this so much magnified Tract, he has been twice distinctly Answer'd, and the World has seen that he neither replied to the particulars of the first, nor of the second Answer, but that at length he fairly dropt the defence of his Charge upon every one of the Thirty seven Points he began with, as the Author of the View has shewn beyond contradiction. But what cares the Representier for all this? Still he goes on proclaiming what Execution his Tract has done upon us: There, says he, are laid open all the Little Tricks and Artifices, &c. There 'twas seen how often abuses in practice were condemned as the Faith of the Church, &c. Here the surprise first began, &c. It began now to appear

## An Answer to the Representer's Reflections

pear that the Papists were not what they had been render'd, &c. Suppose now, that another View of the whole Controversy were taken, and it were discover'd yet more particularly, if that were possible, that there were no such fights to be seen in his Book as he proclaims; still it would hold good, that *Tricks are laid open there, that there it may be seen how Principles are mistaken, Doctrines confounded, and Imaginary Monsters knocked down*, and that that is the Book which can *Inform people of the Truth, and discover to them all the Pulpit-delusions*. For by what I can see, he intends to talk on at this rate as long as he lives, if any Man does but give him occasion; and for his part, he desires no better occasion, than to have it shewn him that there is not the least ground for all this boasting. We have a comfortable employment, to be engaged with such a Writer as this; for if you confute his Charge and his Arguments, he falls a commending himself and his Book as fast as he can; and if you make it plain that you *have confuted him*, and that he has nothing to reply, he takes occasion to write another Book, and to commend himself the faster for it; and to rant as much or more than he did at first.

Which makes me almost wish that the *Defender* had not promised an account of these Reflections. For the Man's Confidence will serve him seven years hence, as well as it does now, and I doubt, something better; for his Force encreases, as that of *Anteus* did, with his Falls. 'Tis impossible that ever he should want Matter, for he can repeat the very same to the Worlds end, if he lives so long; and tho' it has been considered by his Answerers never so particularly, 'tis all one for that, he is grown past taking any notice of such things. For a little variety, he has no more to do but to study some ridiculing *Harangue*, and to gather Flowers from



from Bartholomew-Fair, the Pall-mall, the Gaming Houses, P. 1, 8, 17,  
the Hind and Panther, and such like, for the adorning  
of his Characters, and so he is compleatly furnished  
for a new Book: To which we can have no more to say,  
than to that which we had just before it, unless it  
be to admire the man's Confidence, which we have  
admired so much already, that when we are a lit-  
tle more used to it, we shall not admire it at all.

That he has hitherto behaved himself in this manner,  
is what himself and all the world knows, that has taken  
notice of this Controversy; or at least he has been very  
careful that they should know it now, if they could be  
ignorant of it before: The Author of the *View* had de-  
duced the whole Dispute from the beginning, and it was  
made exceedingly plain, that this man had dropt the De-  
fence not only of every Point he began with, but of  
those very pretences upon which he did so; and the worst  
of all was, that the same Author had made him, as it now  
appears, sick of his last Reply too, where he had diverted  
himself with so many things that were nothing to his  
first business: This now was a very great streight, and  
there was no other way to be taken, but either in *Pru-  
dence* to sit still, and so let the world forget what was  
past; or with exceeding *Modesty* to confess that a man  
may be mistaken, and so forth; or with the excess of  
the contrary quality, to do as the *Representer* has now  
done: For now he has taken up a pretence which he  
dropt the Defence of, but in his Second Reply, viz. That  
his Answerer did sometimes appeal to private Authors,  
and so all that he has said ought to go for nothing.  
*An Answer*, says he, is set forth to amuse the World, as  
the fashion is, with the banding and tossing to and fro of ma-  
ny School-Questions, but never coming to the point of dispro-  
ving the Character of a Papist Represented, or endeavour-  
ing

See *View*, p.  
24.

Pref. p. 2.

## An Answer to the Representer's Reflections

*ing to shew that the Faith as there stated, was not really the Faith of Catholicks; nay, this was scarce so much as offer'd at, except in Two or three Points, which yet ought to have been the main design of the Answerer, and the only way of giving it a just Reply.*

Thus he presses upon us with mere confidence; in which tho possibly he might feel no checks from his own Conscience, yet 'tis something strange that he should not fear his Readers Knowledg; for that Author had sufficiently *disproved the Character of a Papist Represented*, if to shew from Point to Point that it was no sincere Character, be to *disprove* it. He made it plain, that almost every where too much was put in, or too little, as might best serve the design of setting the *Papist* out fairly to the people: The *Representer* should have shewn, that the Answer came short of that Account which the *View* gave of it, *That every Question was particularly and exactly stated; That the Sense of the Church of Rome about it was shewn by the Decrees of their Trent Council, or their Roman Catechism, or their publick Offices, and their most approved Divines and Casuists, as the matter required.*

— *And by the way, all the false Colours of the Representer were taken off, where he thought it for his purpose to lay them on too Foul on his Misrepresenting, or too Fair on his Representing side.* If this was done as it was said, and so done, that the *Representer* has long since dropt his Two or three Exceptions against it, and never from the first ventured upon a particular Reply to it, surely he has been rubbing hard ever since, to come forth now, and think to put us off with saying that the Answer *never came up to the Point, &c.* Indeed he brings over Two or three Particulars again in this Preface, which he Represented upon in his first Book: But is it to compare his own Characters with his Adversaries Answer, and to

\*

shew



shew that he had not come to the Point? No such matter, I assure ye; but only to let us know, That when they represent themselves right, we call it *New Popery*, which he would make the world believe is all that we now have to save our selves from being accounted *Calumniators*; which he pursues with such noise in saying the same thing over and over again, that if Repetition of little Matter, and more Words, were an Argument of Truth, he would be the most convincing Writer that ever set up for the Cause.

For, setting aside the Prophets that cried from Morning to Noon, *O Baal, hear us*; I think no man has outdone the *Representer* in this kind of Eloquence, especially when it came into his head to be revenged on the *Pulpits*, those *High-places* the *Pulpits*, for all the mischief they have done to Popery, and to inveigh against that unlucky distinction between *Old* and *New Popery*.

He tells us, That several things were heard from the *Pulpits* which were found not to square with Truth; and that from those *High-places*, the innocent *Hind* had been made to look like *Tygers, Wolves, and Bears*. P. 8.

All is true Representing when Popery is to be shown from the *Pulpits*. — In this manner did Protestants treat Papists; in this manner are they now handled by Protestants, and yet all must pass for true Representing: And because the *Cath* licks will not own that to be their Faith and Religion, as it stands thus stretched and racked upon Protestant *Tenters and Hyperbolies*, the cry is now forsooth, they are ashamed of their *Old Religion*, and have brought in a *New Popery*. A poor shift, God knows! No, we are not ashamed of our *Old Religion*. — To us the *Old* and the *New* is all the same, &c. P. 12.

But

*An Answer to the Representer's Reflections.*

P. 13.

But this Cant of New-Popery must be kept up to save the credit of the Pulpits. — And were it not for this little come-off, this poor shift of New-Popery, they would be eternally blemish'd with the foulest of Imputations, that of Misrepresenting, of Calumniating, of inventing scandals against their neighbour. 'Tis evident now to those that look upon Popery as it appears amongst us at this day, with an unprejudiced eye, that it has quite another Face, other Colours, other Features, than they have painted her with for so many years from the PULPITS: All that they have heard of from these HIGH PLACES, has been full of Dread and Horror, Cruelty in her Looks, Malice and Wickedness in her Heart, Blood-thirsting in her Desires, &c.

If it be possible, he will make the Pulpits hear of all these things again; and therefore he goes on, *Where are all these Abominations, these marks of the Beast? SHEW US, PULPITS, SHEW US: Where is her Cruelty, her Bloodiness, her Tyranny, her Arbitrary Power? — How many Throats hath she cut? Where has she wrong'd her neighbours? Where is This, and Where is That, and Where are all these Things? SHEW US.*

P. 14.

And if none of these things can be shewn, then the PULPITS must pass for False Prophets, Misrepresenters, and disturbers of the Nation: And what Return now do the PULPITS make to this demand? Oh! This is a New sort of Popery. — The Papists are weary of their OLD Religion, and have taken up a NEW one.

P. 15.

Now this is admirable, if the man had but known when he was well; but he has not done yet by a great deal; for having observed that the Papists are found by experience to be very good men, the Pulpits are sure to hear of it again: *How, says he, shall the Characters of the PULPITS be reconciled with this Experience?*  
Oh!

Ob! The Papists dissemble their Principles, and are ashamed of their OLD Religion; and this forsooth acquits the PULPITS.—And the same poor shift is to serve them upon all occasions; or else what would become of the Pulpits? If the Papists do this good thing, this is presently set out for NEW Popery. The Papists declare this Doctrine. This again is NEW Popery. The Papists teach that Doctrine, and the other Doctrine. This is all NEW Popery. — And it evidently appearing to the world, That Catholicks neither believe nor do as was represented by the PULPITS, the only remedy for the keeping their Credit whole, is to cry out, This is not the OLD Religion, This is a NEW Popery. And indeed it must needs be a NEW Popery to those that knew no more of Popery, than the PULPITS shewed them. — For they who never heard more of Popery, than PULPIT Characters, must needs think the present Popery a NEW Popery. — And who shall ever make them believe that this is that OLD PULPIT POPERY, those OLD PULPIT PAPISTS, which they have so often seen painted out in their Sunday Lectures. — For the Church of England in her PULPITS, made Popery and the Papists so unlike what they now appear; that Popery must be cut into an OLD and a NEW Popery to save their Reputation; i. e. The Reputation of the Pulpits.

P. 16.

And thus he runs on for five or six pages together, crying out, PULPITS! PULPITS! OLD POPERY! NEW POPERY! Pulpit Popery! Protestant-Rack-Popery! Sons of Anak-Popery! Wry-neck'd, Hunch-back'd, Swag-bellied, Broken-legg'd, and Splay-footed Popery! which is the similitude he took from the Posture-Master in the Pall-mall, as he did the former out of the Scripture.

P. 17.

P. 14.

P. 18.

P. 9. Certainly, if one of us had answered him in this manner, and he had got a Companion, it had been the most entertaining sort of Controversie that ever was written; and the world will never care for the *banding and tossing to and fro of School-Questions* any more, after the benefit of *tossing* a few Exclamations to and fro, as he can do it, shall be well understood.

P. 9. Now one would be glad to know what the meaning of all this is; and I think 'tis this; he had observed, that *after all the vain attempts, his first Book remaining in its full force, now at last a new one was invented, viz. That the Belief of Catholicks as there deciphred, is a New Popery.* And he thought that this new force which we had raised against him and his Book, was so contemptible, that he had nothing to do, but to shout it out of the Field. The truth is, after he had persuaded himself that *all the Attempts upon his Book were vain*, he might easily believe any thing to his own advantage; and if what he said of his Book, that it *remained in full force*, had been said of himself, no body would have wondred at him. I have already discovered some fear that all is not well in his head; but if it be so, his disorder inclines the right way, and to make him happy; for if a man has a strong fancy that he has won *Battels*, and conceits himself a very Emperor, and another *Julius Caesar*, or perhaps *Caesar* himself, it may be, as some say, an unkind part to bring him to his true understanding.

But if the *Representer* should merely affect this way of writing, and be sensible all the while how the matter stands; I pity him with all my heart, and so much the more, lest any of those that have not read what was written against his First Book, should believe that it *stands in its full force*, because he

he says so; for there are men in the world that believe implicitly, and this Gentleman must reckon for those that believe him so, as well as they for themselves. If his Livelihood comes in by writing Controversies, he should consider that there are many honest ways of getting a Livelihood, and no necessity of taking this. I will here take occasion to say a good word of my self, and that is, that rather than *prevaricate* in things of this nature, I would make very hard shifts: If it were too late to apply my self to Handicraft Trades, yet may be I could *dig*, or the like; but if I could not dig, I would not be ashamed to *beg*: Perhaps I might get something by turning my Pen another way, and writing of things where I had more liberty, as by writing *Almanacks* or any such thing, where Mistakes will be committed in abundance, and are forgiven in course, and will be sure to do no body any hurt: But to impose upon men in Books that treat of Divinity, is one of the last dishonest things I would take to; I should think of that, and of taking a convenient stand near the Town, much about the same time; and the reason why he that does the one, does not the other, is because all mens Abilities do not lye the same way.

The *Representer*, I imagine, will subscribe to these Notions, and perhaps bid me apply them effectually to my self; which if he does, I will heartily thank him for it, and promise to take all the good Counsel he shall give me, as well as I can, and to follow good Examples where they are to be had.

In these *Reflections* of his, a man must have very good luck that meets with any thing that is worth answering; but if he cannot find what he would, he must learn patience, and be content with what he can get.

P. 9.

I. He would make us believe, That the *only way* of giving his first Book a *just Reply*, was to have shewn that the Faith as there stated, was not really the Faith of Catholics. Now this indeed might have been the *Only way*, according as the Representer might have drawn his Characters; but as he has ordered the matter, 'tis not the *only way*, for he has for the most part *told stories by halves* in the Character of a Papist Represented; and surely one Misrepresenting Trick is discovered on his side, if it be shewn that the Faith of a Papist as stated under this or that Article, is not *all* his Faith, but that it seems there was something concealed which was too bad to be shewn. For instance, The Representer takes occasion to bring in this Character of a Papist under the head of *Indulgences*. The Papists teach, That neither the Pope nor any other Power upon Earth can give leave to sin for a sum of money. Nay, in his first Book, the Papist believes it *damnable to hold that any Power in Heaven or Earth can do it*. Now we will suppose this to be the Faith of a Papist. But then to represent him as he is, he should have added thus much at least; 'That he does not believe it *damnable to hold that an Indulgence or Pardon of sins can be obtained for a Sum of Money after they are committed, nor that the Tax of the Apostolick Chamber, which sets the pardons of the most horrid sins at very reasonable rates, is a Damnable Scandal, nor that they who trust in the Popes Bulls for plenary remission of sins, are damnablely deceived*: Now all this is concealed; and yet I doubt it will be found to belong to the Character of a Papist, with respect to the matter of *Indulgences and Pardons*; and in all like cases to shew what the Representer concealed, is a *Just Reply* to his Characters; but whether it be a just Reply to *Him*, is a point wherein he is more concerned than we need to be.



II. He seems to lay great weight upon this, That *at this pitch of Confidence if not more, are some Church of England Divines arrived, that they pretend to know what the Religion of Papists is, better than they.* — *Is, it likely, says he, the Jews can tell better what Christ teaches, than Christ himself or his Apostles?* — *Can Protestants tell better what Catholics believe, than Catholics themselves?* If the Character of a thing is best received from professed, interested and bitter Enemies, then indeed they may put in for the best Informers of our Faith. Much more he says to this purpose, just as he cried out. *Pulpits and Popery*, without adding any thing of new matter. Now, where no Answers are needful, I am sure these that follow may suffice.

1. 'Tis false, that I (for instance) pretend to know what the Religion of Papists is, better than he, the Representor: But for all that, 'tis true, that unless he mends his Characters of a *Papist Represented*, I do pretend to represent Popery with more honesty than he does. I cannot tell what this Man believes, better than he does himself, nor so well neither; but I can tell as well as he, what their *Trent Council*, their *Catechisms*, their *Pontifical*, their *Missal*, their *Breviary*, and their established Offices say. Are these Mysteries that no Man must pretend to understand but a Representor, and some few besides? For,

2. Why must we be brought in as pretending to know what Popery is; better than Papists know it? Was *Bellarmin* (with all those of the old strain) a Protestant? Is *Father Crasset* a Protestant? or *Cardinal Capisucchi*, who approved the Bishop of *Condom's* Exposition too? Are they Protestants in *Spain* or *Italy*? Do we represent their *Worship of Images* so grossly as that very Cardinal does? Do we represent Popery



perry otherwise than as all these have and do profess and practise ?

3. It had been an Impudent thing in the *Jews*, to pretend that they could tell *better* what *Christ* taught, than *Christ* himself or his *Apostles*. And it was silly in the *Representer* to run to so high an instance, unless he would insinuate that we are as it were *Jews*, and himself a kind of an *Apostle*. I would have him observe, that we are not so senseless, as to think that we can tell what a *Representer* and an *Expositor* teach, better than themselves; but in many things we can tell as well as they; by the same token that they teach some things for *Catholick* Doctrines, which in their Church have been accounted little better than *Heresies*; and suppress others, which their predecessors scorned to suppress. But tho' some *Romanists* do now think fit to palliate their Religion in this manner; yet *Christ* and his *Apostles* did no such thing, and were not therefore liable to that Reproof which these men must bear in spite of their hearts.

4. For what he says, That *Bitter Enemies* are not to be believed in the *Characters* they give of others; I Answer, That neither are designing and self-interested men to be believed in the *Characters* they give of themselves. *Animosity*, says he, sets a Bias upon the Heart. And is there nothing that does it beside ? What thinks he of the Design, to reconcile a Nation so averse to Popery as this is? and of the several conveniencies that will follow such a Change? Nor is it so certain that we are their *Bitter Enemies*, as that they are very great *Lovers of themselves*. I am so far from being a *Bitter Enemy* to the *Representer*, that I am now doing him the Office of a *severe Friend*, by telling him the Truth, which he cares not to hear; but, it may

may be, I may bring him to blushing, which he seems to have taken his leave of; and he may in time thank me for it. I tell him, that in this place he talks wretchedly, and I desire him to *reflect* upon himself, before he pretends to make any more *Reflections* upon us. *Don't every body know*, says he, *that the Church of England has proclaim'd her self an open and professed Enemy to the Church of Rome? Does not this unqualify her for a True Representer?* Now admitting our Church to be as *open* and *professed* an Enemy to his, as she is to the Errors and Abuses of it; yet *who does not know* that this can only *unqualify* her for a *Representer*, to be *believ'd* upon her own word? But she may Represent *truly* for all that: Which is so plain a Case, that this Man, if he was in his right mind when he wrote those things, *could not but know it*. The most therefore that he could honestly make of this supposed enmity of our Church against his, is, that we are not to be trusted with an *implicit Faith*; which we desire not to be; but rather to be believed in these matters so far as we prove what we say, and no farther: And if he be trusted no farther, we desire no more.

III. *We offer*, says he, *and are ready to accept any into our Communion, that will but embrace and receive the Doctrine as it there stands* [in his first Book] *under those very colours, and that shape; owning, not only the substance of it, but even that appearance, &c.* Now this he hath offered twice or thrice before; and his offer has been as often answered, but he will not take the least notice of it. He thought at first no doubt, that here he had nicked the business; but tho he has had some reason to fall in his opinion of the

\*

Proposal,

Proposal, yet he comes over with it, as if this too remained in its full force. I will try, however, if it be possible, to oblige him to reflect upon what we have to say in this matter.

1. Then this offer ought to be esteemed no otherwise than a Ludicrous one, made without good Faith, and with no other meaning than to put some colour upon his own deceitful Characters of a Papist; because he has been told, and indeed could not be ignorant of it before, that we cannot swallow Popery even as he has smooth'd and gilded it for us. He has in the first Answer to his Book, *our Reasons against Popery, as by him Represented*; which he did not, and I imagine durst not reply to. And so long as our Reasons are good against that which he confesses to be Popery, he offers a vain tryal of his sincerity about that which he denies to be so; because he knows, that as the Case stands 'tis impossible for us, if we will keep a good Conscience to accept the offer. And therefore this beloved offer of his, which he intended for a Varnish to set off his Characters, will to all men that can use their Eyes, give a just occasion to suspect they are false; and that the sincerity he has used in his Representation, is of one piece with that which he has shewn in his Proposal.

To which I may add, That if we are very sure that his Characters are Deceitful, if we see that himself declines the defence of them, and that no importunity will provoke him to undertake the vindication of them, and that he writes time after time to excuse himself from it; we cannot have just cause to believe that he is not deceitful in the offer he makes upon such Characters.

2. Suppose that we could accept, and should be accepted here upon the Terms he propounds, yet we have no security that when we are in, this Representer either can, or will if he could, save us from being pressed to profess and practise that Popery which he either denies or conceals. On the one hand we are very certain that the prevailing part of his Church holds that, which he either rejects from his Faith, or says nothing of; and (if we understand any thing) that they declare agreeably to their Councils and Publick Offices. On the other hand, we have no reason at all to believe his Authority in the *Roman* Church to be considerable enough to carry on his Representation when the turn is once serv'd; or to secure us from being served in due time, as Monsieur *Imbert* has been, who was basely left in the lurch by the Bishop of *Meaux*, after he had declar'd for worshipping not the *Wood*, but Christ, not the *Cross*, but him that suffered on it. Where the *Inquisition* is set up, could this Man, that talks as if he were somebody, govern the proceedings by his Characters? If he thinks that he could, that's a new Reason to suspect that his Wits are set aside by self-conceit: If that he could not, what Conscience could it be in him, to try if he could draw us into Snares? and by his *New Popery* wheedle us into a subjection to the *Roman* See, and so into a necessity of being used as the Physician at *Goa* was, who suffered under the Inquisition for two things, whereof one was, no more than his declaring, as his Accusers said, that an Ivory Crucifix was a piece of Ivory, which, I should think, may as safely be said according to the Rules of *New Popery*, as what the Representer offers might be done, *viz.* to burn an Image or a Crucifix if that will satisfy us that he has no Superstition in these things.

things. For, as I remember, he talks at that rate.

But then again, if the Representer were a Man of that Figure in his Church as to be able to save us in a time of Exigence, we have not yet any good reason to trust him that he would be willing to do so, for he has not given us reasonable assurance that himself rejects that *Popery*, which he knows we call so. I shall therefore take the same liberty with him, that he has done with us, and put him upon a Test, which I think he cannot honestly refuse. He has taxed his Answerer with charging the Determinations of *Schoolmen*, and the Sentiments of *private Authors*, and some Passages in *Old Missals* and *Rituals*, upon the Church of *Rome*, as if her Doctrine were to be concluded from thence. I will not here repeat what has been said in answer to it. But this, I say, will the Representer be content to go through his *Thirty seven* Points as they are considered by his first Answerer, and make his Mark upon every thing which he rejects, and which he says we falsely charge upon the Church of *Rome*, and declare before the World upon his honest Word, what it is that he believes to be impious there, and ought not to be fastened upon his Church? This perhaps would be something, and we who are not a little disposed to hope well of other Men, might then conceive our selves obliged to think that he means honestly. He has more than once or twice offered, that his Church shall receive us upon his Terms, and he has been answered. But, as I do remember, he has been asked whether he would refuse us if we desired to come into the *Roman* Communion, with that which we call *Old Popery*. But I do not remember that he has answered to that. And yet I will assure him this was a very material Question; and which I will make him take notice of here if I can.

Will.

Will the Representer take us by the hand and present us to his Church, if we should come with the *Literan* Popery about deposing Sovereigns for Heresy, and with the *Trent* Popery about the Worship of Images, as it is understood by *Bellarmine*, or rather by *Capisucchi*, and as it is practised by the *Tartuffs* of the *Roman* Church, and with all that old Popery which the Answerer gives an account of? If he will not undertake for us upon these Terms, let him do two things which may fairly be demanded:

1. Let him go through the 37 Heads, as I said before, and tell us particularly what the Answerer charges upon Papists, which we do well in rejecting, but ill in imputing it to them. And,

2. Let him say plainly to every particular where he thinks there is just occasion to say so, The Church of *Rome* will not receive you if you come with this Belief, or with this Practice, which yet you presume to call Popery.

But if the Representer will undertake for us upon these Terms, even of Popery as 'tis represented by that Author; then I must beg of him to tell us what he meant by such Expressions as these. *If you have truly represented the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, I would as soon be a Turk as your Papist.* That Imaginary Monsters are raised up to knock down at pleasure: That we raise a Monster of Religion, such as none can be in love with, but those that are bold enough to embrace Damnation bare-fac'd, and then this is the Character of Popery. And much more to the same purpose which he says up and down in his Replies. Nothing is more familiar with him than to say, we *abhor*, and *detest*, and *abominate* that which is charged upon us. But I beseech you, Sir, is your Church so *Catholick*, as to take in Men

Reflect. p. 18.

Pref. p. 1.

pag. 21.



who say and do such things as part of their Religion, which you *detest* and *abominate*, who come with a *Monster of Religion that none can be in love with*, but the Lovers of *bare-fac'd Damnation*? Or does it take in *Turks*? for you would as soon be a *Turk* as our *Papist*, as you told us long since. Here I am apt to think you will need all the improvement of your Confidence, and it will not help you neither. You have been thus long dancing in a Net, and if you are not secured that way I have so often hinted before, you will now begin to see it. For I pray observe, if the *Characters* that your first Answerer let a *Papist* out with, are black enough to make a Man look like a *Turk*, nothing could have been more easie to note than these *Characters*; and you know *Monsters* are very remarkable things, and may be shown with a Finger. \* And therefore we do expect that you would now at last point them out, as they lie *at large* (for so you say they do) *throughout the Answerer's Book*. And when you have done this, it will then come upon you to declare whether with these *Monsters* you will present us to your Church, and undertake for our Admittance, or not. If you will not, pray say so, and by the way think of giving some account how those Schoolmen, and private Authors came to be the celebrated Members, and those *Old Rituals* and *Mass-books* the standing Offices of your Church; for you do not accuse your Answerer for seeking any where else to find these *Monsters*. But, to come close to the Point, if you will take any Man that comes with these *Monsters*, have we not great reason to suspect that if we should come without them, you would not expose your self to defend us from them, if it should be thought fit to let them loose upon us? I hope therefore that we shall be troubled with this offer



offer no more, of coming into your Church upon your Terms, till you give us some better reason than yet we have had, to believe that you are willing to secure us from those Terms, which in general you say are monstrous, but which you have not yet told us what they are in particular.

HERE THEREFORE I CHALLENGE YOU TO DECLARE WHAT THOSE PARTICULARS ARE, THOSE MONSTERS, THOSE DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES WHICH YOU DO SO DETEST AND ABOMINATE ; AND IF YOU REFUSE SO TO DO, I FASTEN UPON YOU THE MARK OF INSINCERITY AND JUGGLING, FOR OFFERING THAT WE SHALL BE RECEIVED INTO THE CHURCH OF ROME WITHOUT THEM.

For, observe me Sir, if for fear of falling foul upon those of your own Party, you dare not declare in particular what those Monsters are ; tho this be necessary to gain us to your Communion ; how much less will you stand between us and them when once we are gain'd ?

Nor must you think to give us the slip now, as hitherto you have done. It will no longer serve your turn to feign *Characters* of a *Papist Misrepresented* for us, and to *raise up Imaginary Monsters*, as you speak, to knock down at pleasure. Remember to take your Answerer's Characters of a *Papist*, who has so described your Religion, that you would as soon be a *Turk* as *his Papist*. This you know is to be done for *our* satisfaction, and therefore our Characters of a *Papist*, as we describe them for our selves, not as you describe them for us, are to be marked by you. Remember again, that you go from Point to Point, and tell us all along as you go, what

what it is in his way of stating your Religion, which you detest and abominate ; for we shall take it for granted, that you do not detest, or at least that you do not say that you detest, what you let go without any note of your Indignation. In a word, this is but what you ought to have done all this while, and the Representing Controversy had been soon at an end. But now it is necessary for you to do it, that we may at least know what your Popery is, and what reason we have to trust your Offers.

Whether I shall hear from you upon these Matters, I cannot foresee ; but in the mean time I do not much care if I give you my Thoughts concerning the bottom of this Business ; I question not but you are willing to receive us into the *Roman Church*, upon our making the Profession of your *Papist Misrepresented* ; and, I have some reason to think, upon much easier terms of *Profession*, for which I shall by and by give my Reason. If we would but do as you do, we might for some time put what Interpretation upon it we please. If we would subscribe Pope *Pius* his Creed, we might deliver in a Protestation of what sense we please ; if we would but adore the *Cross*, and worship the Sacrament as you do, we might declare what Intention we please : But in Matters of Religion, Insincerity and Dissimulation are such odious things, that we who dare not prevaricate with our own Consciences, can neither have a very good Opinion of those who would help us to do so, nor of the Cause which needs it. We cannot but see that the secret meaning of all is this, that we must submit to *Rome*, and do as they do at *Rome* ; and till better care can be taken, we may be allowed to comment upon what we do even as we list, and while we take our Rule of Faith and Worship from Papists, we may

may, if that will content us, go on to talk like Protestants. And I doubt not, but that if this were honest, we might make better Conditions for our selves, than the Representer has made for us. One thing I am sure of, that the Converts of the City of *Orange*, were received upon such easy terms in point of Declaration, that if Subjection and Communion had not been to follow, one would have look'd upon the whole Transaction, as a solemn Jest between the French General, and the Bishop of *Orange* on the one side, and the Citizens of *Orange* on the other. The Passage is very remarkable and instructing, and therefore I shall not think much to set down the Articles of Reconciliation, as I have received them from hands of unquestionable credit.

I.

' The Citizens of the Town of *Orange* that are under written, considering that it is the Will of God (of which Kings are the principal Interpreters) ' that all *Christians* should reunite themselves into the ' same Church; To testify their submission to the Order of the Divine Providence, and that which they ' bear to the Holy Intentions of the King; do intreat ' of his Majesty, that his Troops commanded by the ' Count de *Tessé*, should depart from them; and that ' the Expence which has been, or shall be made by ' them, be levied upon the whole State, without distinction of Religion.

*We Order the Execution of the present Article, according to the full Tenor of it.*

*Tessé.*

†

'They

2.

‘ They declare that they do reunite themselves to the  
 ‘ Catholic Apostolic and *Roman* Church, after the man-  
 ‘ ner which that Church do’s use, to believe and to  
 ‘ profess all the *Christian* and *Orthodox* Truths con-  
 ‘ tained in the Holy Scripture, which God hath mani-  
 ‘ fested to the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists, fol-  
 ‘ lowing the Interpretation and Sense of the Univer-  
 ‘ sal Church, and renouncing all Errors and Heresies  
 ‘ contrary thereunto.

3.

‘ That for their great Consolation and Edification,  
 ‘ every *Sunday* before the Service, there shall be read  
 ‘ a Chapter of the Holy Scripture, of the Old and  
 ‘ New Testament in *French*, according to the Tran-  
 ‘ slations approved by the Church; and that all the  
 ‘ Divine Service which is performed in *Latin*, shall be  
 ‘ explained in *French* by the Pastors of the Church.

4.

‘ That they shall invoke no other besides God the  
 ‘ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

5.

‘ That they shall not believe that it is necessary to  
 ‘ Salvation to have any other Intercession and Media-  
 ‘ tion, than that of our Lord *Jesus* Christ towards  
 ‘ God the Father.

6. That

6.

‘That they shall not be obliged to render any Divine Honour to Images which shall be in the Church.

7.

‘That they shall adore *Jesus Christ* in the *Eucharist*, who is Really, Spiritually, and Sacramentally contain’d in that Adorable Sacrament.

8.

‘That this Consolation shall be given to the Faithful, that they shall communicate in both Kinds, if the Universal Church shall think it convenient.

*Done at Orange the 11th of Nov. 1685.*

‘We *James d’Obeilh*, by the Grace of God Bishop of *Orange*, Abbot and Count of *Montfor*, Counsellor of the King in all his Councils, have admitted these who are countersigned, to the Reunion of the Catholic, Apostolic, and *Roman Church*, upon the Conditions expressed in the Eight Articles above written. Done at *Orange* this 13th of *Novemb.* 1685.

*John James* Bishop of *Orange*.

The Representer may, I think, see in this Example that he is out-done in his own way, and that there are in the World more mild and inoffensive Representations of *Papery* than his own; and some provisions for

H

saving

saving the Consciences of the Reformed, which himself has not made. But I would know of him whether he do's believe that those who united themselves to the *Roman* Church with these Cautions, can be reasonably judged to have proceeded with satisfaction in themselves, and about what they did: Or rather, whether there be not all the Signs that one can have in a thing of this Nature, that being distressed between a troublesome Conscience on the one Hand, and Count *Tessés* Troops on the other, they *capitulated* as well as they could for their own quiet, and granted what they did, to be delivered from the Souldiers; and no more than what they did, if by that means they might pacify their own Minds. A very miserable Case most certainly! And that which is yet more to be lamented is, that these things should be done by *Christians*, upon *Christians*. Let the Representer take it into his serious Consideration, and I believe it will be one of those things that he will always forget to put into the Character of his Papist Represented.

But why must the Minds of Men be racked in this manner? Why must they be brought under the most dangerous Temptations to cheat themselves, and for the gaining of rest from outward Miseries, to betray the Tranquillity of their own Consciences, and be constrained to play such Tricks with them, as if one Man should chuse to put upon another, he would be accounted no better than a cunning Knave? He that cannot see the true Reason of this unmerciful dealing, and that too by this very Example, can see but little. It is *Union*, that is to say *Submission*, to what they call the *Catholic*, *Apostolic*, and *Roman* Church, that must be by these means, or by any means carried on. This we meet with at the very head of the Provisions, and again



again at the foot of them in the Bishop's Certificate; Nor are any of the Reformed to expect otherwise but that this shall be expressly insisted on.

But because the poor People knew that Union to that Church carried dreadful Things along with it, therefore they struggled, and it seems they gained one of the prittiest Limitations of that Union that ever was heard of; viz. *To believe and to profess all the Christian and Orthodox Truths contained in the Holy Scripture, which God hath manifested to the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists.* But then this Limitation would make the Union very insignificant: for thus one may be united to the Turk, viz. *to believe and to profess all the Christian and Orthodox Truths contained in the Holy Scripture.* And therefore something must be added to that; and certainly greater Artifice on both sides, shall seldom be seen, than what is shewn in putting in these words, *after the manner which that Church dos use*; which may indifferently refer, either to *reuniting* or *believing*. The People may understand it of being *united* to the Roman Church, after the manner it uses, till the Bishop teaches them to understand it of *believing* the Christian Truths of the Scripture, *after the manner of that Church.* And so by *understanding the Scripture, after the Interpretation and Sense of the Universal Church*, the Bishop has his meaning, and they have theirs as long as he will suffer them. The most jealous Princes never treated more nicely for their Honour, than these poor Protestants did for their Conscience, and their Masters for the Church of Rome. And considering that they had but two hours allowed them to unite to the Roman Church, before the last Extremity should be used upon refusal; and that there were *Difficulties on both Sides*; the Protestants consulted for their Consciences as much



as it was possible for Men to do, who saw Misery before them, which they had already so deeply tasted of, that their Hearts were quite sunk with the apprehension of what was just coming. But is this dealing for the Credit, I will not say of the Managers, but of the Cause they serve, and of the Method that is now taken to serve it by *Expositions* and *Representations*? Why, if no more sincerity were used in Fairs and Markets, than this comes to in the Concerns of Everlasting Salvation, Men had better live alone, and make what shift they can each one for himself, than to have any thing to do with one another. I was going to dissent upon every one of the other seven Articles; but to shew the Intrigue of them, though never so gravely, would look so like a *Farce*, that I count it decent to forbear, lest I should seem to make sport with the Sins and Miseries of Men. I shall only give the Reader this Note, that the Relation only says, there were *Difficulties on both Sides*, but that by the wording of the *Conditions*, it appears very probable that the Citizens had brought them in another Form, when the Capitulation began; but that this was all they could obtain; and now that they are reduced to this Form, the sagacity and watchfulness of one side is no less discovered, than of the other. But, O God, to what a pass is the State of Religion brought amongst *Christians*!

I have here given the Representer an Example of reconciling *Protestants* to the Church of *Rome*, upon Terms much after his own way, only 'tis something finer; though the Application I confess was more rugged, the Principality having felt the Dragoons to the ruin of it; and the utmost Extremities being threatened in two hours, in case of refusal to subscribe.

Thus

Thus much at least they gained, that they might not be obliged to go to *Mass* for three Months, nor to be present at the Offices of the Church; which was a plain demonstration that these miserable Persons had subscribed with an unsatisfied Mind; and that *Union* and *Submission* was the thing aimed at by the Reconcilers: but whether it was done upon the Convictions of the Citizens, what cared they? I can give no farther account of this Matter, but shall only put the Representers in mind of one Passage in the *State of the Controversy*, which he cared not to reflect upon, viz. That after the Bishop of *Meaux* had treated of a Reconciliation upon Terms more moderate than his own Exposition, while the Dragoons were at the Gates; he came in three Months, and treated them now as Persons Reconciled; and without any regard to his own Promises, or to their Consciences, let the Dragoons loose upon those that refused to compleat their Conviction by going to *Mass*. The Representers may from all this, pick out some Reason, why he ought to be ashamed of his Offer, that we shall be received upon the Terms of his Book.

State. p. 23.

IV.

I come next to his Quotation of Mr. *Montagu*, from whence he would prove that the Church of *England* began too early to Misrepresent Papists; so deserve now much credit in her Representings. But what shall I call our Representers here? Not the *modestest* thing in Nature; for Mr. *Montagu* is most vilely abused by him, while he makes him bring in the Homilies as representing the Papists. That which he says of them is this; 'That they contain certain godly and whole-

Appello Casarum c. 23. p. 60, &c.

†

'some

*some Exhortations* to move the People to Honour and  
 'Worship Almighty God, but not as *the publick Dog-*  
*matical Resolutions* confirmed of the Church of Eng-  
 'land. And again, They have not *Dogmatical Posi-*  
 'tions or Doctrine to be *propugned* and *subscribed* in  
 'all and every Point, as the Books of *Articles* and of  
 'Common Prayer have. Then follow the words which  
 the Representer begins with, *They may seem* secondly  
 to *speak somewhat too hardly, and stretch some Sayings*  
*beyond the use and practice of the Church of England,*  
 both then and now; which last words the Representer  
 mentions not, nor these that follow immediately;  
 'And yet what they speak, may receive a fair, or at  
 'least a tolerable construction and mitigation well e-  
 'nough. For you have read peradventure, how  
 'strangely some of the *Ancientest Fathers* do speak,  
 'and how they *hyperbolize* sometimes in some Points  
 'in their *popular Sermons*, which in *Dogmatical De-*  
 'cisions they would not do, nor avow the Doctrine by  
 'them delivered *resolutivè*.

Now the occasion of all this was that Mr. Mountagu  
 was charg'd by his Adversaries for granting an allow-  
 able use of Images, contrary to the Homilies of the  
 Church of England in the Sermon against the *Peril*  
*of Idolatry*, which seemeth to inveigh against all use of  
 them. To this Mr. M. answered as before, producing  
 the Homilies not as speaking of what the Papists do,  
 or not do, but as universally condemning the use of  
 P. 262. Images in Churches. And he gives this account of  
 it more fully, than I need to transcribe, *viz.* That as  
 the *Fathers spake against Images with some tartness and*  
*inveighing sort*, lest the *Christians*, who had been Pagans  
 themselves, and now lived amongst *Pagans*, might  
*learn to worship Idols*. So our Predecessors coming late  
 out

out of Popery, and conversing with Papists, and knowing that Images used to be crept unto, incens'd, worshipp'd and adored amongst them, might, if they were suffered to stand as they did, induce them to do as they had sometime done; and therefore in a godly Zeal such as moved Ezekias to destroy the Brazen Serpent, they spake thus vehemently, and indeed hyperbolically against them. For the People with whom they then dealt were by all means to be preserved from the taint and tincture of their Superstitious Practices.

This is the whole truth of the business, which the *Representer* did not think fit to shew, but without taking the least notice of the occasion and subject of this Chapter, runs away with a few Phrases, that he pick'd out from the rest, as best fit for his purpose; such as hyperbolizing, stretching upon the Tensers, by all means, and the like; and would make as if Mr. Mountague confessed the Church of England regarded not how she represented Papists and Popery: Which wretched dealing is according to no common Honesty but his own; and whoever goes on at this rate, will write himself out of all Credit, and there will be no need of answering his Books.

'Tis to the same purpose that he brings in Mr. M. again, not thinking it any Reflection upon him if he does not altogether agree or subscribe to the Doctrine of the Book of Homilies in his time, because it being a Book fitted for a Season, and declared necessary for THESE Times, what great wonder if what was a good Doctrine under Edward VI. was not so in the time of King James, &c. For thus he would persuade us that we alter and change our Religion according to Times and Seasons, which is what we justly charge upon them. The Compilers of the Homilies and Mr. M. meant the

Pref. p. 19.

the same thing, which this Man may shew a fault in, when he can, *viz.* that more Care is necessary at some times to secure People from *Image-worship* than at others, though our Religion, which will not allow us to worship Images, be the same at all times. If he thinks that the Homilies stretch their *Hyperboles* too far, let him compare them with what *Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix*, and other Antients say of the same Subject, and then tell more of his Mind. But since, as Mr. M. judiciously observ'd, their severe Reflections against all use of Images whatsoever, are to be interpreted by the danger of being seduced to Idolatry which the Christians were in in *those Times*; so may the less hyperbolizing of our Homilies bear a good Construction with reference to *These Times*, in which we are sure Images are worshipped by certain People that the Representer can tell of, with no less Devotion than the *Pagans* worshipped theirs.

The Reader, I hope, will now excuse me, for taking no more notice of his protesting against the distinction of *Old* and *New* Popery, his declaring that their Belief is always the same, and his lamentable Complaints that we are Misrepresenters, and that we rake together  
 Pref. p. 20, 21. *some odd Opinions out of private Authors, &c. that the Heads upon which our Representing stands are so many Fallacies and Sophistry, &c.* For if a Man, after the Particulars of his Book have been particularly answer'd, will still betake himself to general Out-cries, and makes as if he intended to go on in this way as long as he lives, he ought to know at last, that he may do so without any more disturbance, and that no body will go about to answer him.

And so I come to consider his *Reflections* upon the *View of the whole Controversy, with the Answer to his last Reply*. It seems the *Stater*, as he observes, had so good an Opinion of it, that he thought it would put an End to the Controversy. The Representor says that he is almost of the same Mind. And I say that I am altogether of the same Mind: And so there is one thing in which we do all of us almost agree.

But why is the Representor almost of that Mind? "Because the Answerer had said so little to that long Bill which was drawn up against the Members of his Church, wherein the Crime of misrepresenting is laid to their Charge; that besides what he confesses, the very Guilt appears so plainly in the forced Excuses he makes for the rest, that there's little need of any more besides reading his Defence to see how far they are from being innocent." *Pref. p. 22.*

So that by his own Confession, he brought in a long Bill against some of our Church, wherein the Crime of misrepresenting is laid to their Charge. And the truth is, it was long enough considering that it had neither Truth nor Pertinence, as it was particularly shewn him in the Answer to his last Reply.

For I must add, that the Answerer brought in a longer Answer of about 28 Pages to the Particulars of the Representor's Bill, not omitting any one Charge upon any one of our Authors, where there was direction to the Passage by Page or Chapter.

And I do assure the Reader, that those six or seven Lines of his which I transcribed just now out of his Preface, is all the Reply that he has given to that Answer. And I desire the Reader to remember and consider, that that tedious Charge of his, the Defence



of which he now so visibly forsakes, was manifestly brought in to supply the place of defending his 37 Points of Representation, nay and of defending his very Pretences for forsaking them : And yet that now at last he forsakes the Defence of those Imputations upon particular Authors, by which he hoped to divert the Reader from an expectation of Replies pertinent to his first undertaking.

Now therefore I apply my self to the Representer, and desire him to take as much notice of what I say, as if there was a Finger against it in the Margin : That because he was so very modest, as not to offer the least particular Reply to those Answers to his Charge ; therefore his continuing that Charge is the greater *Impudence*.

With all my Soul I wish that the Gentlemen of the Church of *Rome* would imply other sort of Men to write against us, for this Man carries on the Controversy not only to the disparagement of their Cause in particular, but to the discredit of Religion in general.

But since I have such a Countenance to deal with, I must not think to let even those six Lines go without some particular Answers to them : For tho he can with a good Grace, drop his own Challenges and Undertakings one after another, and as he once said, *gravely turn over* I know not how many Pages of ours, without offering a word to any one Particular that he finds there, and never change Countenance for the matter : Yet we are to watch every Line of his, and unless we intend to have another Book from him, we must prove that the Sun sets before Midnight, if he should happen to deny it.



He pretends that his Answerer said *so little* to his *long Bill*, &c. What should I say to this? Should I print over again here the 28 Pages which were taken up in refuting those Cavils of the Representer? Or is it not enough, that I do now forbid him to make any Replies to the Particulars of that Answer?

He pretends that the Answerer *confessed* something, *Besides what he confesses*, says he. So that if he may be believed, the Answerer has *confessed* that some of those whom he mentions, have misrepresented the Church of Rome. But this is adding Sin to Sin: For he *confess'd* no such thing, and I will add that he had no cause to confess it.

These words indeed I find in the Answer. "Did ever either of his Adversaries undertake to justify all that any Protestant Divine or Historian has at any time said in opposition to Popery? Or, was it not possible to give a more honest account of Popery than he did, without such an Undertaking? *And again.* "Tho it be no part of our business to bring off every thing that has been said or done by Protestants, yet I shall a little examine what our Representer has charg'd those with, whom he has singled out to expose them to the World—For my own part, where his Accusations in whole or in part fall justly, there they shall lie for me, nor will I make another Man's fault my own, by going about to defend it.

But is this *confessing*, that *Misrepresentation* was proved upon any one Author that was charged with it? The Answerer it seems was resolved, as became him, never to wrangle either for a Friend, or against an Enemy; and he found in the long Bill one or two

filly Sayings of Protestants, which this Man called *Misrepresentations*; for instance, a very weak Inference of *Sutcliff's* from as weak a Proposition of *Aquinas*. For this reason the Answerer thought fit to declare, that he would not justify what he thought was to be blamed. But if this Man was resolv'd to call what he pleas'd a *Misrepresentation* of his Church, by his leave he should have asked the Answerer, whether he would call it so too, before it was lawful for him to bring in the Answerer confessing I know not what, of our misrepresenting the Church of *Rome*. For my own part, I am resolv'd, that if any particular Authors of ours have in any one Point misrepresented Popery in the least degree, I will not do it for Company, nor defend those that have done it. But I am not a little pleas'd to find that when the Representer forsook the defence of his 37 Chapters, and diverted to the business of transcribing all those Protestant Authors, where he hoped to find some Instances of our *misrepresenting*; he should yet come in with so lamentable an account on his part, and not be able to produce any one clear Instance to support his Charge.

When I had read his Charge, I was something amaz'd, that considering how much has been written against the Errors of the Church of *Rome* since the Reformation, by Men of different Abilities, he should not have been able to make better work of his last impertinent design than he did. And it will be to all impartial Judges an Argument, that the several Writers of our Church have upon the whole matter, observed a strange exactness of Truth in charging the Church of *Rome*, when this Man was able to produce

no more than he did for a colour to accuse us of the contrary.

But what do we think the Representer concludes in another place from the Answerer's declaring beforehand, that he will not be answerable for *every thing that has been said or done in opposition to Popery*? Why, says he, *then it seems now there are some Protestants that charge more upon the Papists than can be well brought off or justified, and some Protestants are accused justly, and not to be defended without partaking of their fault.* What, of misrepresenting the Church of Rome! But the Answerer did by no means confess that he had brought any pertinent Instances of that. There may be such for ought I know, and if there are, let them bear it as I said before; but as I say now, the Protestants have been very honest and careful as to this business of Representing, or surely we should have had one or two clear Instances of the contrary from this good Friend of ours; unless we should say 'tis all one to him whether his Instances be good or bad, because he has a certain quality that will make them do whether they will or not: Which I believe will be acknowledged by every one that considers those words of his which immediately follow. *If this had been as freely owned at first, we had excused a great deal of Pains and Paper; for I had never gone about to prove that Protestants misrepresent Papists, if the first Replier had thus ingenuously confess'd that Charge. And because it was not owned, I therefore found my self obliged to take some Pains about it, that is, in my long Bill that was drawn up, &c.*

Pres. p. 26.

P. 26.

P. 22.

Well! He has now done His worst; for the next stretch beyond this will break him. I confess that the Answerer did *ingenuously* declare against abetting

ting any Man's *Misrepresentations*: But that he did *ingenuously confess that Charge* against the Authors that were produced, is, what I hope no Man living this day, excepting the Representer only, will have the face to say. He I know *took some pains to prove* the Charge, and the Answerer took a little Pains too about the business; but surely he was as much beside himself, as sometimes I would for Charity sake imagine the Representer to be, if he was all the while *ingenuously confessing it*; for I verily thought, and do think still, that he was all the while plainly and honestly *confuting it*.

But because upon this occasion I would be glad to understand with what Caution a Man must write, that has to do with one of the Representer's Constitution; I have severely examin'd what occasion this Man should pretend for the liberty he takes. I find that as to one or two Instances the Answerer acknowledged a fault where the Charge was laid, but he did not confess that it was *Misrepresentation*. *Sutcliff's* was the plainest, whose Inference from *Aquinas* he acknowledg'd to be very silly. But as to all the rest, he shewed that the Representer's Charge was either false or very foolish: And that this Man was for the most part an egregious Misrepresenter in using those Authors of as ours he did. So that 'tis *Sutcliff's* Case that must bring in the Answerer for that same ingenuous Confession. And the Reader is bound to believe that if we had at first confessed that *Sutcliff* made a silly Inference from as silly a Principle of *Aquinas*, here had been a great deal of Paper and Pains excus'd, and this Man had never gone about to prove that Protestants misrepresent Papists.

And yet after all, his first Answerer would not undertake for all that any Protestants had said of Popery, but appeal'd to the publick and establish'd Doctrine of the Church of *England*.

*Doctr. and Practices of the Ch. of R. p. 9, &c.*

Lastly, he pretends in those six Leaves, that *besides what the Answerer confess'd, Guilt appears plainly in the forced Excuses he made for the rest*. Now if he made but *forced Excuses* for them, he had, I confess, done a great deal better, to follow the Representer's Example, who, when some Popish Authors were charged for most vile and scandalous reports of us and our Religion, was so very prudent as to make *no Excuses at all* for them.

Which gives me occasion to say here, what the True reason was of the Answerer's putting together those few Instances how we have been used by those of the *Roman Church*. We hoped this at least from the Representer's First Book, that it would occasion such a clear and perfect stating of the Questions between us and the Church of *Rome*, that the People of both Communions would be well prepared to understand afterwards the pertinence of the several Arguments and Answers that should be brought on either side. Nor could any Man of Sense and Honesty imagine that his Book was good for any thing else, but to lead to that. With this purpose the Learned Author of *the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented*; complied in his Answer to the Representer. But it was none of the Representer's Designs, that People should know the True state of the Controversy, but that they should believe his

Represent-

Representations; and therefore he has ever since, by one Wile after another, declined closing with his Answerer; and at last by raking for Instances of *Protestant Misrepresenters*. This Design he largely pursued in his *long Bill*. The Author of the *View* having shewn him that he was foully to blame in charging even those Protestant Writers whom he singled out, took a course to divert him for the future, from this wild and unprofitable way of proceeding, and that by letting him see that if he was resolved to persist in this way, he would lose by it; since he would not be able to excuse his own from those Faults, which he had without just cause charged upon our Men. And so he shewed by a few Instances, how *Protestants* had been used by *Papists*. Now one would have thought, that at least he should have reinforced his Charge upon our Men, and defended his own against the Answerer, if he was still resolved to continue his Clamours of Misrepresentation. But what has he done? He has taken about a Years time to consider of the Matter, and at last replies not to any one Defence that had been made for those whom he had put into his *Long Bill*, and do's not offer the least Syllable for one of those that the Answerer had put into his *Short One*. I confess, he says, that the Answerer made but *Forced Excuses* for our Friends. Now as the Representer has behaved himself, I think my Credit may be good enough to encounter his. I say therefore, that the Answerer made no *forced Excuses*, because for the most part there were no *Excuses* at all, but down-right *Vindications*. And as for the *Excuses* that are there, if there be any such, I do not desire the Reader to take my word for them, if he will promise not to  
take



take the Representers neither, but to go to the View, and Judg for himself.

After all, the Representer is to be commended for one thing, that he says the Answerer *drew him back to his first Book*---in reality to put a stop to this part of the Controversy, and that we might hear no farther of the Church of England's Misrepresenting. For though he meant this to the Answerer's Disgrace, yet 'tis true that this was one part of his Design, for he saw the Representer was got upon an Idle Haunt, and therefore shewed him that it would turn to no better account for him, than any Body else. But this was not all, for the Answerer would have drawn him to his First Book, that he might either like an able Man defend his Characters, or like an honest Man confess that he could not; which had been something towards the settlement of the State of the several Questions: Though I think they must be acknowledged to be well settled by the Learned Answerer that first appeared against him, since the Representer dares not go about to stir them. But whereas he thinks, he was fetched up to his First Book, *under a pretence* of shewing him, that he had drop'd his Cause, and gone out of the way: I confess all that too, excepting the word *Pretence*; For his Answerer did the Business so effectually, that I forbid the Representer so much as to *pretend* to vindicate himself against those plain and particular Proofs of this thing that were brought against him. For that he is well resolved against any such *Pretence*, is plain to me, from the Similitude wherewith he has fortified himself against all thoughts of any thing like a Reply to the *View*. For, says he, *this is nothing but what we see by daily experience, that*

when two have been debating a Point a great while, at length one that finds himself aground, begins to unravel the whole Dispute from the beginning, with you said this, and I said this; and then you said this, and I said this, and you said this. I hope the Reader will not so much as suspect that I have abused him in this; but if he thinks it incredible that a Man in his Wits should put such silly stuff into a Book: I cannot help it if he takes him to be out of his Wits; but as for these Sayings, I am sure he may find them in the Preface to his *Third Part*; and though the Pages are not numbred, he may find them in that Page to which I have referred in the Margin, if he will please to number them himself.

P. 23.

P. 24.

And yet after all, he would not have it thought that he is afraid to go back as far as to the *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*: Which he does for a notable Reason, viz. to give us an account once more of his Design in writting that Book, and of his *Motive* to it. His Design was to describe a Catholic as he is, and as he is thought to be. His Motive was an Observation of his, that his Catholics suffered very much by *Protestant Misrepresentations*.

But that which follows is rare, that he did not think himself obliged to give an account of both his Characters to Protestants. Indeed, as for the Character of a *Papist Misrepresented*, he looked upon that as something relating to them. But as for that of a *Papist Represented*, it belonged not to Protestants to meddle with that at all, but only to his pretended Catholics. For, says he, to whom should the examination of a System of any ones Faith belong; besides those whose Faith it is said to be? I thank him heartily. It seems we are to take from

from him a System of Popery, without examining whether it be (as he speaks) *exact and true*, or not; and the reason is plain, because as yet 'tis not our *Faith*, and therefore the *examination* of it *belongs not to us*. But when we are become *Papists* upon his Terms, then if we please we may examine whether it was wisely or foolishly done of us, to take a *System* of the *Popish Faith* upon his Word. And therefore he could not be obliged to justify his Character of a *Papist Represented*, after we had shewn it was not a sincere *Character*, because we meddle with a Matter that *belonged not to us*, and was none of our Concern.

But for one thing we are not a little beholden to him, that though in truth we were busy where we had nothing to do, *viz.* in the *First, Second, and Third Answers* to him, yet he mended the Matter for us, by *looking upon those Answers as chiefly relating to the Character of a Papist Misrepresented*, in which he confesses we had something to do: So that though those Answers *chiefly related to one*, as we thought, yet he did but *look upon them*, and forthwith they *chiefly related to the other*. And so care is taken for the Character of a *Papist Represented*.

We will go to the other Character presently, when I have given him a necessary *Item* upon this great Occasion, *viz.* that when he draws any more double Characters, he would take very great care, that his *Papist Misrepresented*, be drawn very honestly, that we may the more easily swallow what he says of a *Papist Represented*; lest if we find, as hitherto we have done, that he plays tricks in a Business that does *belong to us to examine*, we should have the less reason

son to take his word for a Business that does not belong to us to examine, till we have taken his word for it.

And now for the other Character; he observed, it seems, that *the Answers appeared to be all from Church of England hands, who seemed much concerned to clear themselves from being thought Misrepresenters; and therefore they denied the Charge, which as he says, was part of their Plea.* But therefore it might be expected, that he should either make good his Characters against the Church of England-Men, or hold his hand till some other Protestants came forth to clear themselves, who had Misrepresented Popery, just as he pretended *some* Protestants at least to have done: But being resolved to write on, and not being able to fasten any of his First Misrepresentations upon the Church of *England*, he fell to ransack some *Protestant* Writers of our Communion, for new Misrepresentations. And so the *Misrepresenting* side of his Characters was left to shift for it self, as well as the other.

But why were not his first Characters of a Papist Misrepresented, either proved against us, or charged upon some Body else, or confessed to be impertinent and foolish, as the second Answer shewed most of them to be? What excuse has he for troubling the World with a Book of two Columnes, neither of which he thought it his Duty to defend? Why, he tells you that he *Fathered not the Character of a Papist Misrepresented upon the Church of England, but upon his own APPREHENSIONS.* So that he

he wrote half a Book against *his own Apprehensions*; and as long as he was sure that his *own Apprehensions* would not write against him, he was secure also that he should never be obliged to defend his Character of a *Papist Misrepresented*, against any Body, and therefore not against the Church of England.

Indeed he tells us, some time after, that he *set down* P. 26. *some former Apprehensions of his own concerning Popery, with some little Addition of what he had heard from others.*

And again; I said, that Character was according to P. 27. *the Apprehensions I had formerly of a Papist — and if I extended it any farther than my self, it was because I had found the same in others.* But he is as secure from being called to account by those *others*, as by his *former Apprehensions*. For if those *others* be some Body, they must needs be ashamed to appear in this Business; nor do I think they are capable of writing Books, who charge the Consequences of what the *Papists* hold and do upon them, as their declared and avowed Doctrines and Practices. But if those *others* be *No-body*, then there is *No-body* to hurt him. He understood his Advantage in all this perfectly well. For, says he, *This, i. e.* that he had heard the same from others, *was no more to be denied or disproved than the other part, as it related to himself.* 'Tis enough, says he, for my purpose, that in the *Misrepresenting Character*, a *Papist* is expressed and made to appear otherwise than he is, and that I apprehended a *Papist* something after that manner while I was a Protestant. When this is disproved, I have something to Answer, but till then I can have forsaken no Defence, because nothing has been said against me, &c. If this Man can forbear disproving

proving himself, all the World can not touch him, whatever he makes bold to write. But let him alone, and he will in time do his own business, as he has begun to do it here. For now he tells us that he apprehended a Papist *something* after that manner. *Something* is a dangerous word in this place. For if he did not apprehend a Papist *altogether*, or *very much* after that manner, I wonder who is to answer for the rest. For I reckon that his *something*, and the little *Addition* he heard from others, will hardly save half his Characters from being an Imposture, if we judg of it by his own words.

P. 25. But, says he, *what then signifies all the noise of my having forsaken the Defence of the thirty seven Chapters in my first Book?* I know not truly what else it should signify but an undeniable Truth that he has *forsaken* it. For he has *forsaken* the Defence of the Papist *Represented*, because that *belonged not to us* to meddle with, but only to his *Catholicks*. And he has *forsaken* the Papist *Misrepresented* too, for though this Character *something related* to us, as he once thought, yet upon better consideration, that *belonged to us* no more than that other, but only to *his own Apprehensions*, and to some *others* in the Clouds, that are never likely to give him any disturbance.

Well; but he has shewn however that the Church of England has *misrepresented* Papists, though perhaps not according to his first Characters of a Papist *misrepresented*. Now though this be a Charge which we might be concern'd upon other accounts to confess against those particular Men, that are arraign'd by him, or to disprove it: Yet still it remains true, that



that he has forsaken the Defence of both sides of his 37 Chapters, as the Author of the *View* has unanswerably proved: And in his wretched way of shifting it off, he has confessed it as much to his shame, as a plain Confession of it had been something for his credit. But then I add, that neither is it true that he has proved his new Charge of Misrepresentation either upon the Church of *England*, or upon Church of *England*-Men. For his saying that the Author of the *View* seemed to give up the Point, and that he freely owned it, and the like, is a stretch beyond what is at any time done for Mony. For the World sees, that on the other hand, that Author pretended to shew that the Man was in this also an egregious Misrepresenter of our Writers. And one would think it was done effectually: for the Man has dropt also the Defence of that his last Charge against the particular Answers that were made to it; just as he dropt all before, only with this Addition of Face now, that the Author of the *View* had freely owned it, and ingenuously confess'd it.

If this Answer of mine should fall into the hands of any of our Communion, that have not read these his *Reflections*, I must once more confess my self a little afraid, lest they should think I banter him in this account of his shuffling off one thing after another. And therefore I do solemnly assure the Reader, that he does not say these things once only, but he comes over with them again. And because 'tis an extraordinary case, I must transcribe him; and first where he speaks of his Character of a *Papist*-Misrepresentation.

Well,

*Well, says he, but in so doing, i. e. in proving his new Charge of Misrepresentation, I left it seems the Defence of the thirty seven Chapters. How so? As to the first Character in all these Chapters, I only undertook to set down some former Apprehensions of my own concerning Popery, with some little Addition of what I had heard from others. Now what had I to defend in this? Could any one say I had not such Apprehensions? or, that formerly while a Protestant, I had not such Notions and Thoughts of the Papists, and of their Religion wrought in me by what I had heard from the Pulpit and other-ways? And if this neither was nor could be pretended, what had I to defend in that Character throughout the thirty seven Chapters?*

*Then as to the second Character. What Defence, says he, have I forsaken there? — I undertook to give an account of my Religion as I was taught it. — The Religion there delivered is the Popery I was taught; there is expressed the Papist; I then was at the penning that Character, and now am. And this I suppose no body has disproved yet, and so I have forsaken no Defence of it. So that this Character was written too according to his own Apprehensions: And unless a Man can prove that he had not those Apprehensions of Popery, since he became a Papist, and when he wrote his Characters, it is to no more purpose to write against this Representing Character, than it is to write against the Misrepresenting Character, unless one could prove that he had not those other Apprehensions of Popery, when he was a Protestant. Never was Man so secure against being confuted. I do not wonder at his Confidence*

fidence at all, for he has reason for it, and such as I believe no Man ever found out before him. And I expect that in his next Book he should with no little Triumph tell the Reader, that I confess him to be *Invincible*.

But I must not forget that other Reason, *viz.* of this Character *not belonging to Protestants to examine*. He says, *If there was any thing faulty in this, I expected to hear of it from Catholics, for whilst I pretended to deliver their Faith, who should judge whether it was right or wrong but they?* And at this rate he goes on for almost two Pages together, concluding, that *the current passing of the Book and general reception of it without exception, i. e. among Papists, was enough to warrant the Doctrine for Authentick*.

And now he had nothing to account for, but forsaking the Defence of his Reasons for that Popery which he owned. For the truth is, he forsook all, as the *View* undeniably shewed. Only there is one Quality which God grant he may forsake, but I fear he never will. I will not give it the *Name* here, but leave the Reader to do that, when I have given one more Instance from our Representer of the *Thing*. And so, says he, *at last it is here confess'd that the Doctrines are rightly proposed, and that I have duly represented a Catholick, but that I made no Defence of the Reasons*. He had before brought in the Author of the *View* as *freely owning and ingenuously confessing the Charge of Misrepresentation*. And now at last to make one side hang even with the other, he brings him in *confessing* that he had *duly represented a*  
L Catho-

Catholick too. This Man has considered *Machiavel's* Rule, that he that will thrive by the left-hand way, must never look towards the right one.

Well, he tells us now for a close, that *he has not been short of any thing he undertook*. Not of any thing? What is then to be said for forsaking the *Reasons*; the *Defence* of the *Reasons*? Why, he has a trick for that too, and because it cannot be mended, the old one shall serve the turn. Says he, *Since I only engaged to set down some of the Reasons which hold Men in that [the Roman] Communion, 'tis plain I did all only by way of proposal or historically, and till some body has demonstrated that these are not some of the Reasons which hold Men in that Communion, I have no Defence to make, and so can have forsaken none*. That is to say, his business was not to set down *Reasons*, and make them good afterward, if any body should be so cross as to set upon them, but his business was to shew some *Reasons* for his *Doctrine*, such as they are held by, but whether they were good *Reasons* or bad *Reasons*, what was that to us?

At last we have a *Reason* why he was not for *Disputing*, viz. because *nothing has been offered in that kind by any Adversary, but what has been answered by Catholicks five hundred times over*. Now five hundred is a good round even Number, and he was loth to make it irregular by adding *one* more to it; for then it must have be said henceforward, that we had been answered *501* times over. This I take to be as good a *Reason* as any we have had from him yet, or are like to have from him in haste.

To come to a Conclusion : He began with his *double Characters*, and forsook the Defence of them.

He gave us *Reasons* and *Reflections*, and he forsook them too.

He made a *Fanatick Sermon*, and great defiance there was about it; but the Sermon was undertaken, and we hear no more of the Sermon.

He tried what was to be done by drawing up a *new Charge of Misrepresentation* upon some *Protestant Writers*. The Charge was answered; and he takes no farther care of that Charge; if it will stand upon its first Legs, well and good: if not, what cares he?

The Author of the *View* gave him a sample of some *Popish Misrepresentations* of us and our Religion. And he does not offer so much as to excuse them, no not by a word.

What is to be done next?

Even let us once more begin the World again, with *fifteen* new Chapters of a *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*; for the worst is past, we may speed better next time; but 'tis impossible for us to come off more shamefully than we have done already.

---





A  
R E P L Y  
T O T H E

VINDICATOR'S *Full Answer.*

**T**HE *Vindicator* has express'd some contempt P. 1. of the *Defenders* last Book. If I had been in his case, it had been some temptation upon me to do the like : And therefore I will not aggravate this Matter against him.

Some Anger also is express'd, for being told by the Author of *the Discourse concerning Extreme Unction*, that the Bishop of *Meaux* and he might now go and put words together, especially because *another Tear* was given them. I perceive he scorns to have it thought, that he either needs the Bishop of *Meaux*'s help, or a *Years* time to put words together. And so about a Month after the *Second Defence*, out comes a *Full Answer* of his own.

As for the Bishop, the *Vindicator* has said nothing for him : And I think the Bishop is beholden to him for it, who is in this one thing happy that his *Vindicator* has left him to shift for himself.

When I saw a Sheet and half come forth for a *Full Answer* to the *Second Defence*, I presently understood, the Man's meaning to be, that the *Defence* had little

or

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

or nothing in it. For some such thing as this, the Defender insinuated of the Representer's last Book, by calling his Postscript, a *Full Answer* to it. But now the Representer has been answered more largely in the foregoing Part, and therefore we might expect in Honour a more Full Answer than this *Sheet and Half* to the *Second Defence*. But we expect no such thing for all that: For tho' as the World goes, some Men are forced to say much against Nothing, yet others finding it very painful to say much for Nothing, have had the Face to call *Half-sheets* and such things *Full Answers* to such Books; as if their more Learned Predecessors were now alive, they would have given us, we are apt to think, what weight they had, and at least equal measure in Return for them.

P. 2.

To this *Full Answer* of his, I intend to give a Reply more Full than his Answer is, which slips over many Considerations in the Defenders Book, for which I am sure he cannot pretend in the Representer's strait, that they have been answered five hundred times over.

He declares once for all, that he is resolved not to let any of the Defenders pretended Proofs escape, or any thing that looks like a solid Answer pass unsatisfied. Which Declaration was the more fit to be made once for all, because it would trouble a Man's Conscience again to make it the second time: or at least it would startle the Reader as often as it was made.

But in pursuit of this Intention as he says, and it may be to make good his own Title of a *Full Answer*, he falls in the first place upon the Defender's Title-Page; where he would have had the Book called, *A free Confession of the Matter of Fact in all the Vindicator's*  
 Except-

*Exceptions.* The Defender, I am sure, neither pretended to *prove* nor to *answer* in his Title Page. But they are often busy, where no need is, who are idle where their Business lies. However I shall remember this, and desire to know what there is in the Book to make it deserve the Title of a *Free Confession*, &c.

In the mean time I observe, that he and the Representor are agreed to rid their hands of this Controversy, by affirming now at last, that we *freely confess* something or other, which they have all this while laboured in vain to prove.

But before I have done with this Full Answer of his, I may perhaps convince them both, that they did not lay their Heads long enough together; and that while they were agreeing what to make us *confess*, they forgot a more material Point, and that was, now in so great a strait as the Representing Controversy was reduced to, to agree in what they should confess themselves.

The First Part of the *Defence* which he pretends to answer, is the *Historical Vindication* of the *Distinction* between Old and New Popery. For the Defender observing how much that *Distinction* was disliked by this Man, told him, that he *found it in effect made to his hand in some of the Bishop of Meaux's own Converts, and in Books which are said to have undergone his particular perusal before they were permitted to come into the* *Def. Pref. P. 3.*  
*World.*

But the Vindicator declares, that in the proof of this, *when he came to examine it, he found nothing to the purpose.* Which is more than I shall say of his *Exceptions* to it, for I think something will be found in them

them to our purpose, how little soever there may be to his own.

The First Instance of the Converts is Monsieur Brueys, who vehemently exhorted the Protestants to return to the *Roman Communion* by this Argument, That *the Doctrine of the Church was so expounded, as none of their Forefathers understood it.* Of which, and much more to the same purpose, the Vindicator says, *I stand in need of your Spectacles, Sir, to see how he [Monsieur Brueys] proves that there was New and Old Popery any where, but in the Conceit of our Adversaries, their Forefathers, as he calls them.* Which certainly is none of the wisest Answers that ever was made, because it grants a *New and Old Popery* somewhere, though it be not so honest, as to confess it where it is. Because he was resolved not to find it where Mr. Brueys did, and where it is to be found, he would find it where it never was, *viz. in the Conceit of our Forefathers.* But neither dos Mr. Bruey's arguing suppose that our Fore-fathers had any such Conceit, but the quite contrary, nor is it in it self true that they had ; For there was no such Distinction going in their Days, nor occasion for it. The Reason why our Fore-fathers never understood Popery, as it is now understood by Monsieur Brueys and the new Converts, is, because the Bishop of Meaux's Fore-fathers never explain'd it, as 'tis explain'd now by him, and some few others that have taken the hint from him. And this New Exposition must have made a *New Popery* according to that Gentleman, because the whole Force of his Argument to persuade his Old Friends to turn Papists lies evidently in that.

He says indeed, That if their Protestant Forefathers had believed things to be as in effect they were, and are now proposed, they would never have separated from the Communion of the Church. In which words I acknowledge that he lessens the Difference between the Former and Later Expositions of Popery, as much as ever he can: Which no Man will wonder at, who considers that he is a Convert. But 'tis plain that he makes the Difference to be the Reason why on the one side their Forefathers went off from the Church of Rome, and why on the other side themselves ought now to return to it. And this I am sure is *in effect* to confess an *Old* and a *New* Popery; and not only a more clear and intelligible way of expounding the very same things, which the Bishop of Meaux has got above all that were before him: Unless the Vindicator will say, That their Forefathers, as well as ours, were so stupid, that they could not see, either the one what Doctrines they held, or the other what they rejected; but were still playing at Blindman's-buff about Notions which they could not make one another understand, because they were not able to express them as they ought to have been expressed: Which I am confident Mr. Brueys will never say, and perhaps not the Vindicator neither; tho, without saying it, he must in spite of his Heart find a New and Old Popery acknowledged by that Gentleman, and that there was no occasion for that distinction till these happy Days of ours.

But for the Vindicator to find in Mr. Brueys's words a New and an Old Popery charged upon the Conceits of our Forefathers, is so very ridiculous, and utterly inconsistent with his Argument to persuade us to put *Matters into the same State in which they were* before, by reuniting to the Church of Rome; that any one

may see he was hard put to it to make this Testimony nothing to the purpose, because, rather than fail, he would make Nonsense of that Gentleman's Arguing, where his Purpose is as clear, and his Sense as intelligible, as a Man would desire it to be.

He answers next to what was observed again from Father *Craffet*; but we will consider what belongs to him by it self, and in the mean time go on with the Converts.

Page 4

The next produced was Monsieur *Ranchin*, who confessed a New Popery more boldly and roundly than Mr. *Brueys* did. The Vindicator therefore flurs off his Testimony with saying only this: *The Defender has shewn of what Credit such a Persons Authority is, who weighed things so little, as to sell his Religion for Money and Preferments.*

But this is not so easily to be set aside. For, if he sold his Religion, as there is too great reason to fear he did; yet his Testimony to the Distinction between Old and New Popery is a very good one, and an unanswerable Proof of what the Defender said, That the Distinction was not of his own making, but that in effect he found it made to his hands amongst the Bishop of *Meaux's* Converts.

Men often change their Religion for Worldly Interests; but I think they never say so, and that because they would still keep their Credit. For which reason, if they pretend such Motives to the Change they have made, as are Matters of Fact easie to be judged of, they will not be so careless of their Reputation, as to pretend those things which the World can bear witness against. Therefore since Mr. *Ranchin* laid his Change upon the great Difference between Old and New Popery, there is no reason to question, but whether



ther this was the principal Cause of his Conversion or not, yet such a Difference was commonly believed: nay, and that the Alteration in the Bishop of *Meaux's* way of expounding Popery, from what had been in former Times, and from the Belief and Practice of the *Tartuffs*, and the *People* that now are, was indeed notorious. For otherwise he had taken a better way for his Reputation, to pretend that he had been convinced by Old or by New Arguments, of the Truth of that Doctrine, which the Church of *Rome* constantly and universally held, than to say that he was enlightened by a New Exposition, no less needful for the Saving of *Catholics*, than for the Conversion of *Protestants*. For whether such an Exposition made any notable difference in Doctrine from what went for Popery before, is a Matter that they can easily discern, who perhaps are not so good Judges of a Disputation for Popery or against it. If therefore Monsieur *Ranchin* was as careful of his Credit, as he was solicitous for Means to live like a Person of Quality, he no doubt was very sure that the World was sufficiently aware of a notable Difference between the Old Popery of the Church of *Rome*, and the New Popery of the Bishop of *Meaux*: And it was frivolously done of the Vindicator to refuse his Testimony, because the Defender was afraid his Worldly Interests had too great an Influence in the Change.

Really if these Men serve their New Converts in this fashion, it will mightily discourage them. They have sweetned and gilded Popery for them, to make it go down the better; and yet they will not allow them to say what it was that made them swallow it with little or no straining. Tho Ease, Honour, and Wealth did effectually determine them, yet they should

be permitted to tell their Friends what made the Change somewhat easie, *viz.* that which these Men designed should do it: Or else our *English* Representatives and Vindicators may spoil their Market here, before they have well begun to bid for Converts. And this Inconvenience may presently follow, that those who have yielded to them upon New Terms, will begin to suspect that their Instructors mean to bring them into the Condition of the *Tartuffs* and the *People* in due time, since they will neither themselves acknowledge that there is such a Difference, nor so much as suffer their Converts to make any words of it, but fall to reproaching them when they do so.

Pag. 4.

The same Reply may serve to the Vindicator's Exception against Mr. Pawlet, who *because he made his Conscience comply with his Interest, is no fit Man to be brought in as one of the Defender's Witnesses for such an odious Accusation.* So says the Vindicator. But Mr. Pawlet was not the less *fit* Man for that: For altho Insincerity does by no means qualifie a Man to be a *Witness*, yet there are Cases in which the Testimony of an Insincere Man cannot reasonably be refused; that is, when his Interest does manifestly oblige him to speak the Truth. Such is the present Case. For had there been no good ground for this Distinction between Old and New Popery, as these Men would now persuade us there is not, Mr. Pawlet, by using that Distinction, could not but know, that in stead of covering his own Insincerity, he had more openly exposed himself for a Knave.

Pag. 4.

He calls this Charge of an *Old* and a *New* Popery an *Odious Accusation*, as the Distinction it self but a little before was *That Odious Distinction.* But he forgets that this Distinction, as Odious as it is, is used by

by those of his own Communion, and who being Converts, their Testimony is so much the more remarkable. They cannot be presumed to distinguish thus for the prejudice of their Converters, nor to make the Distinction a matter of *Accusation* against them, as the Vindicator very poorly insinuates. They use it to defend themselves against the Expostulations of those whom they have forsaken; and the nature of their Defence implies not only that they believe what they say in this Case, but that they had reason to believe it. For if it were altogether a Dream of theirs or ours, that there are two sorts of Popery in the Communion of the *Roman Church*, they might as well have defended their Revolt by pretending that the Church of *Rome* requires not the Veneration of Images, or the Invocation of Saints in any sense at all, or any other such thing as notoriously False as that would be.

As to the Inhabitants of *Montauban*, that became Converts too upon *M. de Meaux's* Principles, he says, That *their Acknowledgment is no convincing Proof that there was truly an Old and New Popery, excepting in their Imaginations.* But their Testimony, and the former Testimonies, are I hope a convincing Proof, that the Defender did not make this Distinction, but that it was in effect made to his hand even by the Bishop of *Meaux's* Converts: Which is the thing this Man should have spoken to, but that every Mans Case will not bear Pertinence in his Answers.

But I have shewn him by the way, that these Testimonies are a Terrible Argument of the *Thing*, and that there is cause for such a Distinction as this, which, before I have done, I shall make as evident as the cause of another thing is, *viz.* Why the Vindicator is not able to bear the mention of it.

His

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

His harping upon the Odiousness of this *Distinction* and of this *Accusation*, does but give us just occasion to say, that because it was necessary in these times for some of them to bring in a New Popery, they must needs count it an *Odious* thing in us to put them in mind of the *Old* one.

But it seems that if we had said nothing of it, they had been little the nearer ; for the Converts themselves have proclaim'd the *Odious* business ; who, altho they were to be seduced by the inviting Appearance of a New Popery, and some other *New Popery-Motives*, not altogether so Sweet and Gentle, were not yet to be so far trusted with the Secret of this Affair, as to be told that they must conceal it from the World.

These men, no doubt, could have wished, that the Converts and we had kept their Counsel, and left them to be the First Discoverers of it, after that happy Work was done every where, which they call *Conversion*. If they expected this, it was a vain presumption. But whatever they imagined at first, they cannot endure to be told now, that the Trick was invented too late, and discovered too soon to do all those Wonders, which they designed by it. And so much for the Vindication of the *Distinction* of Old and New Popery, by the Testimony of the *Converts*.

The Defender touched upon Monsieur *Imbert's* Story, which also clearly shewed the same *Distinction* going amongst *Romanists* themselves, before the Defender insisted upon it.

The only Question, as to the evidence of this Instance, is, whether Mr. *Imbert* was oppressed by his Diocesan the Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*, for following Monsieur *de Meaux's* Exposition, in declaring that not the *Wood* of the Cross, but *Jesus Christ* who suffered upon it, was  
to

to be Adored in the *Good-Friday* Service. The proof that has been made of this is so good, that the Vindicator denies not the Fact, but contents himself uot to confess it. He saies indeed, *The Bishop tells of Extravagancies committed in the Church by Monsieur Imbert; and I suppose, if it were worth while, he could prove them to you.* But, in Conscience, was it not worth while to prove them, or at least to name them, and to say what they were? Was it not Mr. Imbert, who, in his Letter to the Bishop of *Meaux*, appealed to the Process against him, and desired his Enemies to reproach him for his Life and Manners, or for any other Doctrine than that of his Lordship? Did he not publish a *Fa<sup>ctum</sup>* of his Case all to the same purpose? And can any other reason be given why it is not confuted in the Face of the World, but because it cannot? Sure I am, that if it could have been done, the Bishop might with less pain have disproved it, than it hath cost him from time to time to shuffle it off, in which labour he has so visibly added Insincerity to Insincerity. Can the Vindicator think, that it was not worth while for the Bishop to defend his Reputation against his Inferior, as Mr. Imbert indeed is? But the Bishop is now brought upon the Stage of the World for this matter, and I must tell his Vindicator, that Imbert being not only the Bishops Inferior, but a man oppressed too by the Authority of the Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*, the Bishop of *Meaux*'s Friend; the World does more undoubtedly believe, that he delivered nothing but plain Truth in his *Fa<sup>ctum</sup>*, because if he had in the least swerved from it, he had thereby exposed himself yet more to the power of that Greatness which oppress'd him, to add to his Sufferings now with some Colour of Justice. Whatever was at first insinuated by the Bishop, it now appears that Imbert was no Fool, unless in be-

Defence of  
Exp. p. 126.

believing

believing that the Bishop was in good earnest in his Exposition. But the World will forgive him that, when it will not so easily forgive the Expositor.

What should I say more? the Vindicator himself has in effect acknowledged, that it was worth while to make the pretended Extravagancies, of the unfortunate *Imbert* appear: For he confesses that the severe Reflexions which the Defender makes against the Proceedings of the Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*, are made *justly enough* if *Imbert* said the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth: which is as much as to say, that it was worth while, to shew that the World ought not to think so severely of the Archbishop, as it certainly would, if *Imbert* were believed. But the Vindicator's Consequence is as absurd as possible, that *this will make unbiass'd persons think that Imbert was not just in the delivery of the matter*: For because one Story is good till another is told, unbiass'd Persons must think that *Imbert* was very just in the Relation; since it so nearly concerned the Archbishop to have it disproved, and yet he never went about it. As for the Bishop of *Meaux*, it concerned him much more, who has not only forsaken this poor Man, that suffers for nothing, but conforming to the Bishop's Exposition, but has also endeavoured to take away his good Name; and without offering any colour of proof, has added Reproaches to his other Afflictions.

In short, the Bishop has, in all appearance, said for himself what he is able: But the pretended Extravagancies are yet to be named; unless the Vindicator will insist upon that, for which the Defender has brought Cardinal *Capifuechi*, to acquit Monsieur *Imbert* and to condemn the Bishop: Which I desire the Reader to take special notice of in the Answer to the Bishop of *Meaux's* Letter, p. 41. 42. But I forbid the Vindicator  
ever



ever to say one word about it, or to offer the least Reply to what I add concerning it : That 'tis such a blot to his Bishop, and to his expounding Design, as will stick upon them, till they are so happy as to be forgotten.

But the Vindicator was so sensible of the Evidence of *Imbert's* Story, that he thought fit to make an *If* of the main part of it, and so to speak to the Supposition. *If the Curate*, saies he, *cried out as Imbert accuses him, The Wood, The Wood, he was as much in the wrong as your self*, meaning the Defender : That is, the Curate mistook the meaning of the Church, as much as the Defender did. But the Vindicator should have gone on thus : And *if* the Archbishop of *Bourdeaux* caused Process to be made against *Imbert* for crying out *Not the Wood, but Jesus Christ* ; then the Archbishop mistook the meaning of the Church as much as the Curate. And *if* the Bishop of *Meaux* abetted the Archbishop and forsook *Imbert*, he was more to blame than either the Curate or the Archbishop ; not indeed for *mistaking*, but for betraying the pretended Doctrine of the Church, which he had so publicly owned before.

Now, not to enquire by what Authority the Vindicator pronounced the Curate to be *in the wrong*, since the Archbishop of *Bourdeaux* thought *Imbert* to be in the wrong, and the Curate in the right : This at least is enough for the Defender, that there are two sorts of Popery amongst them, as to this matter of *adoring the Cross* : One, that of the Curate and the Archbishop ; another, that of *Imbert* and the Vindicator ; between both which, the Bishop of *Meaux*, hath, by this unhappy accident, been constrained to play fast and loose. Here, therefore, if I had the Representers Talent, I

might cry out, where is the *Calumny*? Where is the *Misrepresentation*? Where is the Falshood in charging the Church of *Rome* with two sorts of Popery, when the matter of Fact is so evident, that *Process* has been issued out by the *Old* Popery against the *New* in the Proceedings of the *Archbishop* against *Imbert*.

But the Vindicator saies, That the Curate was *in the wrong*, for crying out, *The Wood, The Wood*; and whatever the Bishop of *Meaux* himself saies, his *Exposition* must say what the Vindicator does. But now poor *Imbert* said the same: And yet, tho they all agree in saying the same thing; such is the hard Fate of some above others; the Bishop and his Vindicator flourish and are applauded, for saying what *Imbert* said; but *Imbert* suffers for saying no other thing than what the Bishops Exposition said before him, and his Vindicator after him.

Upon which, no *unbiass'd* man can reflect, but he must acknowledge, not only that there is a *New* and an *Old* Popery amongst them; but withal, That the *New* one is set up for nothing but to decoy us into the *Old* one. For let the Vindicator tell me, why *Imbert* has been so severely treated for saying that the Curate *was in the wrong*, but that he seemed to be in good earnest, and in truth, would not have the *Wood* to be Adored. And if others say the same thing, and are yet approved, what other reason can be given for the Difference, but that they are understood to be *in jest*, as to the matter which they affirm, and in earnest only, as to the end they aim at; which is, in good time, to make us Adorers of *the Wood*, according to the strain of *Old* and *True* Popery. The *Exposition* was framed to catch *Protestants*: It was *Imbert's* mistake, to think it design'd for the Reformation of *Papists*. For which reason,  
 Monsieur

Monfieur *Ranchin* would be advifed to have a care how he talks of the Exposition being no lefs needful for the Instruction of the Catholics, than of the Reformed.

The Defender faid, That *Imbert's* Cafe was enough to clear him from the Charge of *Calumny* and *Falfification*, in that *Account* he gave of their *Good-Friday* Service; and in Tranflating thofe words, *Ecce Lignum Crucis, Venite Adoremus*; Behold the Wood of the Crofs, come let us Adore It. For, fays the Defender, not only the *Curate*, but the *Archbifhop* thought there was no *Calumny* in it: And he would not be fo uncharitable as to wifh the *Vindicator* the like Conviction of it; that *Imbert* has met with. But fince this Man goes on ftill to cry *Calumny* and *Falfification*, I may without breach of Charity wifh Monfieur *Imbert* out of *Durance*, and the *Vindicator* in his room, who without queftion would get out again prefently.

The *Vindicator* fays, That the *False Tranflation* is fo manifef, that he needs not make any more words of it. I fay, If there were nothing to juftifie the Defender's Tranflation, but the *Antiphone* it felf in its full length, that were enough. Behold the Wood of the Crofs, upon which the Saviour of the World did hang: Come, let us Adore. Adore what? It, fays the Defender: Him, fays the *Vindicator*. Now in Common Sense the *Quire* invite one another to Adore that which the *Priest* fhews them with a *Behold*. Surely he that fhould fay, Behold a Houfe by the Wood-fide; come, let us go in: or, Behold a Dinner upon the Table; come, let us eat: or, Behold *Virgil* amongst the Poets; come, let us read; would take it ill to be underftood of any thing, but going into that Houfe, or eating of that Dinner, or reading of that Book. But if indeed

there were any thing in that Service to oblige a Man to depart from the common Construction, as to those Words, and to apply the Adoration not to the *Wood* which the People are called to *Behold*, but to him that suffered upon the Cross, whom they cannot behold, then the Defender would be in an ill Case. But if the Rubric upon this occasion does expressly make the Wood the Object of Adoration, then the Vindicator is in a worse case, who has both the natural Construction of the Words, and the Circumstances of the Place against him.

Once more therefore, and but once, the Reader shall by some part of the Rubric judge of the Modesty of this Man; and the Vindicator shall have the pleasure of imagining all the while, what the Reader must think of him.

*Afterwards, i. e. after thrice singing of the Antiphone, and the Prostrations of all upon thrice shewing the Cross, the Priest alone bears the Cross to the place prepared for it; before the Altar, and kneeling he lays it there. By and by putting off his Shoes, he comes to ADORE THE CROSS, thrice bending his Knees before he kisses it.——After a while the Ministers of the Altar; and then other Clerks and Laics, with thrice bended Knees, as was now said, ADORE THE CROSS. In the mean time, while the ADORATION OF THE CROSS is made, the Expostulations and other Hymns are sung which follow, either all or some of them, as the greater or lesser number of Adorers requireth. One of the Antiphones sung in Common is that which begins, WE ADORE THY CROSS, O LORD. And to make all sure, the Rubric that closes this Ceremony, and passes to other things, begins thus: Towards the end of the ADORATION OF THE*

Missale Rom.  
Feria VI. in  
Parasc.

THE CROSS, the Candles are lighted upon the Altar, &c.

Yet says the Vindicator, *Let us Adore IT*, is a *False Translation*; nay, 'tis so manifest, that he needs not make any more words of it. That it is not False as to the Sense, is so manifest both by the *Antiphone* and the *Rubric*; nor as to the Words by the use of our *English*, which requires the repetition of the thing by a Pronoun, more than the *Latin* does: This, I say, is so manifest, that I will never make any more words about it with the Vindicator, or any one else in his behalf.

And this is the Old standing Property of the *Roman* Missal; by which any body may see, that the Curate had reason to cry out, *The Wood, the Wood*; and the Vindicator none, to say, that the Curate was *in the wrong*, unless by the help of that odious Distinction, which indeed will set all right: For the Curate was in the *wrong* as to New Popery, but very much in the right, with respect to the Old.

The Defender again justified his Distinction by *The wholesom Advices of the Blessed Virgin to her indiscreet Worshippers*, and by the Fate which that Book met with. For those Advices did not only of themselves intimate that there were some in the Church of *Rome* who needed them, but by the Opposition that was made against it, they shewed too, that there were some Practices condemned there, which the prevailing part of the *Roman* Church could not bear the Condemnation of. The Vindicator indeed would make us believe, that the Church is *not to answer for* Pag. 5. *the Extravagancies* condemned in those Advices, because *she has always taken care to instruct the People better*. But he regards not what he says. I pray what care did she take to *instruct them better*, when Monsieur Widenfelt,

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

*Widenfelt*, who took a little honest Care about it, was served as *Father Crasset* assures us he was; when the *Holy See* condemned him, when *Spain* banished him, and forbad the Reading and Printing of his Book; and in a word, when the *Learned of all Nations* were said to condemn him; and all this but for advising the People better? The *Vindicator* calls this a *Scandalous Insinuation*, and says, that the *Defender* knows it to be such, and talks as if he had proved it, without saying a word where he has done so. And yet *Father Crasset* published it no longer ago than in the Year 1679. in the Preface to his *La Veritable Devotion, &c.* What shall we do with this Man, who grows rude when he has nothing to say to the Argument, and will then have us to speak against our Consciences, when he either does to himself, or talks of things without knowledge?

He says, the *Defender* has given us in another place, it may be thro forgetfulness, a short Answer to this; "They who oppose that Book of wholesom Advices, are not therefore Enemies to every one of those Particulars. But how is this an Answer to it? For they must oppose it for something or other that *M. de Meaux* is bound to answer for. For *M. Widenfelt* allows as much to the Blessed Virgin as *M. de Meaux* does; and *M. de Meaux* would be thought to deny all that *Widenfelt* denies to her. When *Crasset* is at leisure to tell us what those Particulars are, which he, and the *Pope*, and the *Learned of all Nations* do condemn, we shall then know more particularly, what we are undoubtedly assured of in the general, viz. That *Crasset* brings the *Universal Church* against the Exposition of the Bishop of *Meaux*: For I say it again, *M. Widenfelt* allows as much Honour to the Blessed Virgin, as the Bishop's Exposition does.

The



The Consequence of all this is clear; if the Bishop has expounded *Popery* to us, as they say he has; and if for all that the Bishop's Exposition be, as Father *Crasset* assures us *Widenfelt's* Advices are, an *Outrage* to the whole Church; then of necessity there must be two *Poperies* among them, and these not only different from, but *outrageously*, contrary to one another.

And here I will take notice of the Vindicator's Exception to *Crasset's* Testimony for an *Old Popery*. Father *Crasset*, saies he, *is again brought upon the Stage, for defending what he himself does not acknowledge to be an Article of our Faith, and therefore belongs not to what you call Popery at all.*

This Man would fain say something, if he knew what: Does nothing then *belong to Popery at all*, which Father *Crasset* does not acknowledge to be an Article of Faith? I am somewhat sure that Father *Crasset* will not acknowledge it to be an Article of Faith, That no more Honour is to be given to the Virgin than what Mr. *Widenfelt*, or M. de *Meaux* allow to be given to her; nay, instead of *defending*, we are very sure, that he has opposed that Doctrine. And does not the Bishop's Exposition of the *Catholic Faith*, in this point, belong to *Popery at all*?

But letting this pass at present, Fa. *Crasset* defends in gross what *Widenfelt* condemns, and does withal, defend it as the Doctrine of the Universal Church, to what he took *Widenfelt's* Book to be an *Outrage*. And if *Crasset* believes what he defends, not only to belong to *Popery*, but to be the true and genuine *Popery* of the Church, this Man hurts himself, and not us, by doing all he can, to prove that *Crasset's* Doctrine cannot *belong to Popery at all*. This is what we say, that some of them call that *Popery*, which others deny to be so,

so, and that what was heretofore universally maintained as Popery, and is so maintained by the most considerable, as well as the most numerous Party of the Roman Church now, is by some others that we have to do with, rejected, as not *belonging to Popery at all*. Which makes good what the Defender said, that *'tis not in our Calumnies, that this reflecting Distinction is to be found, but in the real disagreement of those of their own Communion.*

But because these Men are always flying to the *Churches Sence*, to make them and the Old Papists *One*, though all the World sees that they are divided about this Question, *What is Popery?* therefore the Defender was desirous to know, *what at last this thing called the Churches Sence is, and how we may come to the knowledge of it.*

To both parts of this Question, the Vindicator condescended, tho with some frowning to return an Answer.

Pag. 5.

First, saies he, *the Churches Sence in our Case, is that which she delivers as a Doctrine of Faith, or a necessary Practice.* I should be too troublesome to him, to ask upon this occasion, what he should mean by those Words, *In our case*, and by some other Expressions that occur in the Interpretations of this Answer. I shall therefore take his Answer without any exception to it; that *the Churches Sence, in our case, is what she delivers as a Doctrine of Faith, or a necessary Practice.*

Pag. 6.

But how shall we come to the knowledge of this Sence? To this he answers; *By the Voice of the Church, in her General and Approved Councils, and by her universally practising such things as necessary; That is to say,*

1. We

1. We are to know what she delivers as a Doctrine of Faith, by her Voice in her General and Approved Councils.

2. We are to know what she delivers as a necessary Practice, by her universally practising such things as necessary.

This I take to be his meaning, and to these two Particulars, some little I have to say, with the Vindicator's good leave : And first of the former.

I. Where I desire him not to take it ill, if I ask him one Question or two, with some under Questions which cannot be spared ; for if he has no mind to answer them, he may let it alone. The Question is this ?

“ Whether there be no way to know what the Church delivers as a Doctrine of Faith, but by her Voice in her General and Approved Councils.

The reason of the Question is this, Because if there be another way, and if the Gentlemen of the Old Popery should chance to prove their Doctrine to be the Churches Sence that way, the Vindicator will be at a loss again, and the Sence of the Church in Council will do him little Service in those Points, where, it may be, Councils are silent, if the Sence of the Church out of Council be plainly and loudly against him and his Party.

If the Vindicator then should say, That tho the Church has a Sence of Doctrines of Faith out of Council ; yet that Sence cannot, or at least is never delivered but by her Voice in General Councils. Then I have one other Question to put, which will break out into a few more, but which he who hath considered these things very well, will make no difficulty to answer.

This Question is, "How the Churches Sence came  
"to be known concerning Doctrines of Faith, be-  
"fore any *General* and *Approved Councils* delivered them  
"for such ?

Which Question will appear to be a very rea-  
sonable one, if he will please to read these that  
follow.

1. Whether *Doctrines of Faith* be not the *same* now  
that they were from the Beginning ?

2. Whether the *Sence of the Church* concerning these  
Doctrines has not been always the same ?

3. Whether the Church therefore had not the same  
Sence of them, before they were delivered by her  
Voice in General and Approved Councils, that she had  
afterwards ? Or, Whether she had one Sence, and de-  
livered another ? And then, as I said at first ;

4. If she had the same Sence before it was so deli-  
vered, that she had when she delivered it, and after  
she delivered it ; How came that Sence to be known  
before ?

This, I think, is plain enough ; but if it be not, I  
will try to make it plainer. Therefore,

1. We say with the *Romanist*, That it is a Doctrine  
of Faith, that *The Son is of the same Substance with the  
Father*. But this Doctrine was never delivered in a Ge-  
neral and Approved Council, before the First Council  
of *Nice* ; as it was impossible it should, because that  
was the First General Council. I would know of the  
Vindicator, whether the Churches Sence concerning  
that Doctrine, was not to be known before, and how  
it was to be known ?

2. The *Romanists* say, That 'tis a Doctrine of Faith,  
That in the *Eucharist*, the *Substance of the Bread*, is tur-  
ned into the *Substance of Christ's Body*, and the *Substance*  
of

*of the Wine into the Substance of his Blood.* But this was never delivered in any *pretended General and Approved Council*, as we are very sure, before the Council of *Lateran*, under *Innocent III.* I would know of the Vindicator, whether the Church had the same Sence of this *Transubstantiation* before that *Lateran Council*, which 'tis said to have had since? and whether that Sence of the Church was known? and if so, then *how* it was known?

I have given the Vindicator two Instances, One of a Doctrine of Faith, for which we contend no less than the *Roman Church*; and as we think, to better purpose: Another of a Doctrine which that Church says is *of Faith*, tho we say, it destroys All Faith; and these two in behalf of all that are Real, and of all that are by them *pretended* to be Doctrines of Faith. For till I am better informed by the Vindicator in answer to the foresaid Questions, I say of all the Doctrines of both kinds, that there should be some way to come to the Churches Sence about these things, before she *delivered* her Sence of them, in the *Voice of General and Approved Councils.*

This I shall presume, till he acquaints me otherwise; and if he does not yet understand which way these Questions drive, I will now tell him. Let him keep to his Principles, and shew me, by what way the Churches Sence came to be known concerning *Doctrines of Faith*, before they were delivered by the Voice of General and Approved Councils; and then let him leave it to me, to shew him by the same way, that Old Popery, as we call it, has been the Sence of the Church of *Rome*, till these *expounding and representing Days* of ours: Nay, and that Father *Craffet* shall prove by the same way, that it is now the Sence of the *Roman Church*,

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

whatever some few Men of that Communion may pretend to the contrary.

And when I have done this, the Vindicator shall by me be never contradicted, while he on the other side proves the Sense of the Church to be quite different from what Father *Crasset* in his way proves to be so: For most undoubtedly he thereby does our Work for us, and enables us to prove, that there must of necessity be two Church-Senses betwixt them, and consequently two sorts of Popery, an *Old Popery*, and a *New Popery*.

Whereas therefore the Vindicator says, *Till you can prove by the express Words of a General Approved Council, that what you term Old Popery was delivered as a Doctrine of Faith—all you say will avail nothing.* I would be glad to know what the Vindicator would have said in behalf of Transubstantiation, so some such Man as *Rabanus Maurus*, or *Bertram*, or *Berengarius*, if he had lived in their Times, and they should have said to him, (tho I think in my Conscience none of 'em would have talked so insipidly) *Till you can prove by the express Words of a General Approved Council, that what you term the Catholic Faith concerning Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, was delivered as a Doctrine of Faith, all you say will avail nothing.* Here I will not allow that the Vindicator should bring in the *Doctors* and *Saints* of the Church, who might be pretended to bear Testimony to the Churches Sense in this Point: For he has foreclosed himself as to this Relief, and that by giving the Defender a notable Reason, why all he can say will avail him nothing, if he brings not the express Words of a Council. For, says he, *you bring only the Sentiments of Private Men, which other Members of the same Church condemn.*

I have



I have urged this Matter further than I intended at first, for I meant not to press for Answers to the foregoing Questions with much Importunity. And now I say no more, than that I shall take it very kindly of the Vindicator, if he will please to admit these things into his Consideration, and enlighten me with his Thoughts about them.

II. I proceed in the second place to suppose a very strange thing, for fear the Vindicator should affirm it; and that is, That nothing is to be taken for the Sense of the Church as to *Doctrines of Faith*, but what she declares by her Voice in *General Approved Councils*. For if we take the Cause by this Handle, the Distinction between *Old* and *New Popery* will I believe go on as roundly as it did before: And some Inconvenience too will follow in the Close, to trouble the Vindicator no less than this *Odious* Distinction between *Old* and *New Popery*.

Because I would lead him fairly to the Business, I ask him in the *First* place, Whether his Church hath delivered *her Sense* concerning those two Points, which he mentions upon this occasion, by *her Voice* in *General* and *Approved Councils*, or whether she has not? The two Points are the Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*, and the Doctrine of *Worshipping Images*.

If she has not done it, then in the Church of *Rome* there can be no Doctrine concerning these two things, which can be called a *Doctrine of Faith*. The Vindicator therefore will say, I hope, that she has delivered her Sense by her Voice.

And so I ask him in the *Second* place, Whether by the Doctrine which the Church delivers, he understands only so many *Words* put together, and not rather

ther the Sense of those Words, which *the Voice* of the Church uses, that is, which her General and Approved Councils have put together to express their Meaning by? This is a Question which the Vindicator must needs understand, because I do in effect but borrow it of his Friends: For the like Question has been often put to us by them, and particularly by his good Friend the *Representer*, and, it may be, by himself, *viz.* Whether by the Scriptures we understand the *Words* or the *Sense*? So say I, by the Doctrines of Faith which the Vindicator says are delivered by the Voice of the Church in her General Councils, Does he mean the *Sense*, or the *Words* only of her Councils? I will for once answer for him, That he means the *Sense*, which is contained under the Words.

Pag. 6.

I ask him therefore, the *Third* time, Whether the Sense of those Words, which his General Councils have put together, be not, as he says, *what truly we ought to mean by Popery*? If I may be bold to answer for him once more, he must needs grant it. For if the Churches *Doctrine of Faith* be the same with the *Sense* of her General Councils; and if that which we ought to call *Popery*, and to mean by *Popery*, be the Churches *Doctrine of Faith*; it will go very hard if *Popery* be not the *Sense* of her General Councils.

And now the *Odious* Distinction clears up apace, in going this way to work. For if that part of *Popery* which is made by Doctrines of Faith, be neither more nor less than the *Sense* of General Councils concerning such Doctrines as we *Protestants* disclaim, it follows presently, that the *Sense* of those Councils is *what we ought to call Popery*. And therefore,

- i. I humbly conceive, that if there be two Parties  
in

in the Church of *Rome*, that are not agreed what the *Sense* of her General Councils is, it follows out of hand, that so far they are not agreed about *Poper*y; and that for this very good Reason, Because the *Sense* of her General Councils, and the *Faith* part of *Poper*y, according to him, is all one, and indeed but two Expressions of the same thing.

2. It follows also, That in *what Sense soever* either of those Parties takes the Words of the Churches Councils, that *Sense* is, and must necessarily be that Parties *Poper*y; because the *Sense* of her Councils being *Poper*y, that which is to one Party the *Sense* of her Councils, must likewise be *Poper*y to that Party.

3. If therefore one of those Parties takes the Words of her Councils in one *Sense*, and another takes the same Words in a contradictory *Sense*; then because the *Sense* in which the former takes those Words is the *Poper*y of or to that Party, and the *Sense* of the latter is its *Poper*y; it unavoidably follows, that there are two pretended *Poper*ies betwixt those two Parties, which are inconsistent with one another.

4. If the *Sense* of one of these Parties was that which prevailed without Controul ever since the Council of *Trent*, till very lately, and the *Sense* of the other Party is therefore but of yesterday; then of these two *Poper*ies, the former must needs be the *Old* *Poper*y, and the latter the *New* *Poper*y.

5. So much Reason as we have to believe the *Old* *Poper*y to be the true *Sense* of the Churches Councils, rather than the *New* one; so much reason also we have to believe, that the *Old* *Poper*y is the *True* *Poper*y, and the *New* to be but an *Imposture*, or a *Mistake* of those of the *Roman* Church that have of late brought it up.

6. And

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

6. And lastly, If Protestants did not make those different Senses for them, but each Party in that Church made them for themselves, then this Distinction of an *Old* and a *New* Popery is no Misrepresentation, Falsification, or Calumny of Protestants, but a Distinction grounded upon the Real Disagreement of Papists about *Popery*. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

But I think that Men were never put to it as we are, to make solemn proof of things that are so evident, that they need not to be proved at all.

The Council of *Trent* determines, That we are to *fly to the Prayers, the Help, and the Assistance of the Saints*. If we would know the Councils Sense in this Matter, the *Old* ones will tell us, that the meaning is, we should have recourse to them for *other Aids* besides their *Prayers*. And as one would verily take this for the meaning from the Construction of the Words themselves; so the Terms of Invoking the Saints which were then used in their Offices, and still are so, do manifestly favour that Interpretation. But our New Expositors come and tell us, that they *require no other Aid and Assistance from the Saints than their Prayers*; and the Vindicator intimates, that if they did, we should have *something to say against the Lawfulness of what they practise*. If Popery therefore be not so much the Words of the Council, in which I acknowledge they all agree, as the Sense of the Council, in which they do not agree, how is it possible but that here are two Poperies in this matter advanced amongst themselves, one against the other?

Again, The Council of *Trent* affirms, That *due Honour and Veneration is to be given to Images*. And therefore what one Party in that Church takes to be that due Honour, is Popery to them, because 'tis the  
Sense

Sense of the Church to that Party. And what another believes to be so, is their Popery. And here I am sure if we find a Harmony, 'tis made up all of Discords. Indeed one would have thought, that the Council, by *Due Honour and Veneration*, had meant that Worship which was at that time given to Images, in the *Roman Church*; which their Offices required, and for which their most celebrated Writers had contended. And this way of coming to the Sense of the Council, must lead a Man to the Popery of giving the same Honour to the Image, that is due to the Prototype, or at least an Inferior Honor, by which the Image might be said to be truly and properly worshipped. For the former Sense, Cardinal *Capisucchi* does at this day earnestly contend, and very fairly argues it against all Opposers, from the Words of the Council. But the Bishop of *Meaux*, and the Representer, and the Vindicator, are as cross to that Sense as downright Contradiction can make them: They say, "That in presence of Images respect is paid  
"to the Persons whom they represent; but Images  
"themselves are not to be worshipped. No, God  
"forbid; but only used to put us in mind of the  
"Original. Thus they *explicate the Language*, *i. e.* give us the Sense of their Church in her *Decisions of Faith*: But so, I dare say, as it was never explicated before.

See Second  
Def. p. 31,  
32, &c.

However, if these Gentlemen believe the *Sense* of the Council to be as they say, I wonder how it comes to pass, that the Vindicator should not acknowledge it to be Popery. For he must not forget, that Popery is the Sense of the Church, which she delivers by her Voice in Councils, and therefore that the Sense of the Councils Words is truly Popery: And consequently, what He and His Party take to be their Sense, they

P

must

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

must, in spite of their Hearts, confess, to be their Popery, unless they care not how inconsistently they talk. And then I would ask the Vindicator, whether it be possible to reconcile his and the Bishops Sence with Cardinal Capisucchi's, and those of his way.

The Truth is, the Vindicator has given up the Cause; for by saying, that we *bring only the private Sentiments of Men, which other Members of the same Church condemn*, he confesses, that they do in these things *condemn one another*: Which perfectly acquits us from the charge of misrepresenting them, when we say, that there are two sorts of Popery amongst them; by which, we never meant any thing else, than that one Party of them, and that the greater, does earnestly contend, that that is Popery, which the other utterly disclaims, and does therefore set up another *Sense* of their Councils, and their publick Offices opposite to that of the former.

As for his calling the Sentiments of the opposite Party, *Private Sentiments*. If he means that they keep their Persuasions to themselves, and do not trouble the Church with them; He is to know, that as the Men are *not private*, but of great Note and Authority in the R. Church, and the number of their Followers far more considerable than of theirs who condemn them; so their Sentiments are *not private* neither, but as publick as Disputing for them, and censuring and punishing their Opposers, can make them.

But if I can understand him, by *private Sentiments*, he means, the Sentiments of Men out of Council; so that no measure is to be taken of the Doctrine of their Church, by what is delivered by such Men, tho they be Bishops or Cardinals, and their number never so great, and their Declarations never so publick and



notorious, and their Censures never so sharp against those that oppose them; for still they are but the *private Sentiments of Men* out of Council.

Why then must the Representatives, or the Vindicators, or even his Lordship the Bishop of *Meaux's* Sentiments concerning the Doctrine of the Church, go for any other than the *private Sentiments of Men*? For their Expositions have been neither *made* nor *approved* in General Councils. Must Cardinal *Capifucchi*, the Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*, and Father *Craffet* with his Holy Bishops and Learned Doctors, nay, and with the Learned of all Nations, be said to deliver only the *Sentiments of private men*; whilst a few Teachers, that arose in this Age, whose Party is despicable, who labour under the marks of Insincerity, whose Doctrine being professed in good earnest, is persecuted by that Church, whose Faith it is said to be; whilst those Men, I say, must be thought to deliver the True and Genuine Doctrine of the Church?

But if neither the one side nor the other side delivers the Sense of the Church, Who knows what the Sense of the Church is, and how shall I come by it? The Vindicator directs me to the *Express Words of General and Approved Councils*. But then, I must needs ask him, Who is to be Judge of the Sense of those express Words? I see express Words indeed, and I am very apt to think that I do understand the Sense of plain and express Words. But if I may be allowed to understand *express Words*, why can I not as well understand such Words in the *Scriptures*, as in their Councils? For the Words of the Scripture seem to me to be very expressly against many things that are held in the Church of *Rome*. And here I have been told, that this is not the Sense of the Scripture, but *my private Sense*; that the

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

Scripture is a *Dead Letter*, till the Churches Interpretation gives it Life and *Sense*; that private Judgment is Fallible, and therefore not to be relied upon; that the same places seem to be *express* to one Man for this thing, and to another Man for that thing; that so many private Heads as there are, so many Bibles there will be; that after all our assurance, that we understand plain and express Texts of Scripture, there is no certainty to be had, but by submitting to Authority, and receiving Doctrines of Faith, not from the Scripture, but from the Church.

Well, I submit to the Church, and ask, Where, or by whom she delivers her *Sence* concerning Doctrines of Faith? *Ans.* By her *Voice* in her General and Approved Councils. But where is that Voice to be heard? *Ans.* In the *express Words* of those Councils. I go therefore to those Councils: God help them that can't. Here indeed I find *express Words*, if a Man could but tell how to come to the Sense of them; for I thought my self very sure of the meaning of *express Words* of Scripture: But it seems I was mistaken then. What assurance have I that I am not mistaken now? For *express Words*, are but as express Words in the Councils, as they are in the Scriptures. And if my *Sence* of such Words in the Scripture, was but a private *Sence* before, my *Sence* also of such Words in the Councils is no more now. And therefore if I must trust to my own private *Sence*, I shall be sorely tempted to go back again, and to make as good a shift as I can, with my private *Sence*, and the Scriptures together, rather than follow those who tell me my private *Sence* is not to be trusted, and yet leave me to it at last.

For when all is done, the Churches *Sence*, according to this Man, is a mere Notion of a thing that is

no where to be found ; for the several Sences of her Words in Council, are but the *Sentiments of private Men* ; which this Man opposes to the Sence of the Church, to save his Church from two Poperies. For instance, if I go to Cardinal *Capisucchi* and his Party , to ask them what the Churches Sence is, of that *due Honour and Veneration that is to be given to Holy Images* , they tell me, the very same that is given to the Persons represented by them. But what am I the nearer ? for this is but the *Sentiment* of private Men. I go to ask the Bishop of *Meaux* and his Party, and they cry, *God forbid, the Church requires no such thing.* But I conceive his Sentiment is as private as the Cardinals ; and so is every bodies else that I can speak to ; and, which is worst of all, I must not judge between these different Parties, which of them speaks the Churches Sence, because I am that way Infallibly thrown upon my own *Sentiments*, which are as *private* as can be.

In this State, there being no Council sitting, I have no living Judge upon Earth to help me, and I am sure I must not be a living Judge for my self ; so that I have no Oracle to go to, but a few *Dead Letters*, which cannot speak ; and I have no reason to expect, whilst I am doubting, whether the Words mean *Capisucchi's* or *De Meaux's* Sence, that the Letters should disappear, and other Letters rise in the room of them, and make Words plain enough to end the Dispute. And therefore I think we must do as the Vindicator gives leave, and *suspend our Judgment*, at least, till the sitting of the next *General and Approved Council*, that shall be called, to interpret the last. Tho I do not see how that could end the Controversie ; because the Words of that Council too must be interpreted by *private* Sence, and so to the Worlds end ; till Councils have found  
out

out a way to determine Controversies of Faith, without any *Words* at all. There is, I confess, one way left to come to a certainty of the Churches Sense, if we had it, and but one ; and that is, for every Body to be Infallible ; for by the same reason that they would take us off from the Scriptures, we have not any security by Councils, unless we had an infallible Spirit to interpret ; and then, I fancy, there would be no need of Councils at all ; for an Infallible way of interpreting the Scriptures, will excuse any Mans dependence upon Councils that has it.

Now after these Men have vilified the private use of the Scriptures, and have in effect, made nothing of them, for this Child of the Church to come now at last, in his distress, and make as little of General Councils, is a just Infatuation upon him : Who does not see that to get off the *two Poperies* which are so notorious, he will allow nothing to be *Poperies* but the very *express Words* of their Councils ? which indeed have a Sense, that this Man calls the *Churches Sense* ; but then you are to ask no body what that Sense is : For whoever he is that you ask, he gives you but his own Sense, or his *private Sentiment*. And at this rate, I confess, it will be impossible to find out two Poperies in the Church ; because Popery is nothing but the *Churches Sense*. But then you will not be able to find so much as *One Popery* in the Church, and that, it may be, the Vindicator never thought of. For whilst every body gives his own Sense to the Words of the Council, as they say every one of us does to the Words of the Scripture, indeed no Man can be certain that the *Churches Sense* is not reached by any of the *private Sentiments* of Men ; but who has had the good luck to reach it, the Lord knows ; for 'tis a Happiness, which no Man that has it,

it, can certainly say that he has. And therefore, by that Trick, which serves him to keep *two Poperies* out of the Church, he has unawares thrown out *all Popery*, excepting that dead Popery that lies buried in the Words of *General* and *approved Councils*.

Thus speaking of that which we *Term* Old Popery, and his Parties condemning it, he says, *So long as there is such a Dispute betwixt them whom the Church acknowledges to be her Children, and she does not determine it, any one may hold which side they please as an Opinion, or suspend their Judgment: but neither side is truly what you ought to mean by Popery.* Pag. 6.

So that 'tis neither Popery to worship Images with the same Worship that is due to what they represent; nor is it Popery to worship them with a Worship that is not the same; nor is it Popery to worship them as it were not at all. And therefore the *Children* of the Church may hold which side they please as an *Opinion*; they may with *Cardinal Capisucchi* be of the opinion that *M. de Meaux's* Doctrine concerning due Honour and Veneration *favours of Heresie*, and they may with *M. de Meaux* be of the Opinion, that *Capisucchi's* Doctrine favours of Idolatry. And they that are of the former Opinion may yet with the Cardinal approve the Bishops Exposition; and they that are of the later Opinion, may with the Bishop say, That the Cardinal in his Treatise about Images, had said nothing in the whole that contradicth the Bishop. In short, we may take Due Honour and Veneration, in this Sense or in that Sense, or in any Sense wherein any of the Children of the Church understand it, or if you please, no Sense whatsoever: For you may suspend your Judgment. And if the Vindicator be in the right, that what he has said in this case is applicable to all others; Protestants.

Protestants, without believing one Doctrine of Faith more than they do already, may be said to have as much Doctrinal Popery as the Members of the *Romish* Church it self.

I would have the Vindicator think of these things, and before he sends us again to the express Words of his General Councils, to consider how his Friends have used the Scriptures, and us for making them the Rule of our Faith.

We do not pretend to find in express Words of their General Councils, every thing which we call Old Popery; but we find it in the Profession of the prevailing Part, even of the present *Roman* Church, and in its oppressing those that seem in good earnest to be of another mind. And as we may without blame call that *Popery*, or the Sense of their Church, which themselves call so; so we cannot be reproved for saying, that their *Popery* seems to be the true and genuine Popery, because it agrees vastly better with the express Words of their Councils, than the Popery of our modern Expositors and Representers. But yet for calling this *Popery*, the Vindicator calls the Defender a *Misrepresenter*; a *Misrepresenter* and a *Calumniator* too; a *Misrepresenter*, a *Falsifier*, and a *Calumniator*.

Pag. 6, 7.

Thus he lays about him; without Fear or Wit, and hurts himself more than his Adversary. For his bad Language does furnish me with a Proof that there are *Two Poperies* amongst them, which the dullest Apprehension will feel, and the finest shall not be able to distinguish away.

To take the Vindicator's Instance once more. Here in *England* I make bold to say, that worshipping Images and Crucifixes with the same Worship that is due to the Persons represented, is Popery. And for this  
by



by an Authentic Papist I am called a Misrepresenter, a Falsifier, and a Calumniator too: Which are hard Words, and I would not willingly deserve them. I would therefore know what is the sincere Popery in this case; and I am told, That Images are not properly to be worshipped, but the Persons represented only, in *presence* of their Images. I stand corrected, and desire to know what Rule I am to go by in judging what Popery is in all other Doctrines, that I may not be mistaken again as I was before. The Vindicator tells me, That what I can prove from the express Words of the Churches Councils, and what they have positively defined and declared, that is Popery as to Doctrines of Faith, and nothing else. Well, I am now furnished for a Journey into *France*, or *Spain*, or *Italy*, because now I know what Popery is, as a Man ought to do that ventures into those Parts. There, for instance, at *Sevil*, or at *Bourdeaux*, I am apt to talk as other foolish Men have done before me. *Crucifixes*, say I, are upon no account whatsoever to be honoured with Divine Worship. *Images*, say I, are not properly to be worshipped: No, God forbid. The Church requires it not, and so forth. But I soon find that this *English Popery* (for so I must now call it) does not agree with those Climates, and that my Propositions are *Heretical* there, and since the Definition of the Council of *Trent*, intolerable. I pretend truly that I had my Popery from a Man that admits nothing for Popery but what is proved from the express Words of Councils. They laugh at me, and assure me, that my Propositions are to be found in Councils, neither in express Words, nor by any good Consequence. I desire to know if my Propositions be contrary to the express Words of Councils. They tell me, that they

Q

are

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

are contrary to the Sense of the Council of Trent; and I find, that unless I could shew where the Council does expressly define against what they call *Poperie*, I shall have but little comfort of insisting upon my *English Rule*. That nothing is *Poperie* but what is expressly defined in Council. For at *Sevil* I am forced to retract my Propositions as Heretical, and at *Bourdeaux* I am Imprisoned; and because I am not a *Man of Renown*, my Lord the Bishop of *Meaux* will not break with his Friend the Archbishop for so small a Matter as the Ruine of a *Man of no Renown*. And this I get by learning *Poperie* from the *English Vindicator* of the *French Expocitor*. Now if this be not as clear a Demonstration of two *Poperies* as any Difference in the World needs to have, a Man must be forsaken of his Reason, and bereft of his Senses. For if I say this thing is *Poperie* here in *England*, I am a *Misrepresenter*, a *Falsifier*, and a *Calumniator* too. If I go into a warmer Sun, and say in the simplicity of my Heart, concerning the very same thing, that it is *not Popery*, there I am a *Misrepresenter*, a *Falsifier*, and a *Calumniator* too, for saying so: And which is somewhat worse, if I do but hold my own, they will not only say that I am a *Misrepresenter*, but they will use me like one too, or rather like an *Heretic*.

Now if on the other side a Man has but apprehension enough to understand when one thing contradicts another, as for example, that to say of a certain Doctrine concerning *Image-Worship*, That it is *Poperie*, is a Contradiction to saying of the very same Doctrine, That it is *not Popery*, and that the contrary is *Poperie*: And if, on the other side, he has sense enough to understand when he is rail'd at by those that say tis *not Popery*, for saying that it is; and worse than rail'd

at by those that say 'tis Popery, for saying that 'tis not: I will give the Vindicator leave to write a Book as big as *Aquinas* his *Summs*, and as full of Subtilty, to prove to the same Man, or to any Man else, that for all this there are not *Two Poperies* among Papists.

This of Image-Worship is the Case about which the Vindicator, called the Defender all to naught; and concludes with this remarkable Saying: *What I have said in this Case, is applicable to all others.* With all my heart, for so say I too; *What I have said in this Case, is applicable to all others; viz.* where we pretend this Distinction to hold between Old and New Popery.

I should now leave this Point, but that he still insists with an unparallell'd Confidence, that the Defender is a false Translator of that Passage in the Council of *Trent*, which concerns *Reliques*. I shall therefore once more go our Fallible way to work, to vindicate his Translation, and thereby to shew from the express Words of the Council of *Trent*, that the Old Popery was to seek the Aid of *Reliques*.

The Council having established the Invocation of Saints, proceeded also to establish the Veneration of Reliques, in these Words. "That the Holy Bodies of the Holy Martyrs, and of others who live with Christ, which were the Living Members of Christ, and the Temple of the Holy Ghost, and to be raised up by him to Eternal Life; and glorified, are to be venerated by the Faithful; by which many Benefits are from God bestowed upon Men.

*Ita ut affirmantes Sanctorum Reliquiis, venerationem atque honorem non deberi, vel eas aliaque sacra*

"So that they who affirm Veneration and Honour not to be due to the Reliques of the  
Q 2 monumenta

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

*monumenta à fidelibus inutiliter honorari ; atque EORUM opis impetrandæ causâ Sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari , omnino damnandos esse.*

“ Saints, or that those and  
“ other Sacred Monuments  
“ are unprofitably honoured by the Faithful ; and  
“ that for the obtaining of  
“ THEIR help, the Memor-  
“ ies of the Saints are in  
“ vain frequented, are to  
“ be condemned.

This is a Literal Translation ; and I say, That by *THEIR Help* we are to understand the Help of *Reliques* and *other Monuments* ; not as the Vindicator would have it, of the Saints. To put some Colour upon his own Translation, he inverted the Order of the Words as the Defender accused him, and he has said nothing to it. But *Their Help* must be the Help of *Reliques* and *Monuments*, because otherwise the Construction of the *Latin* is False, and against Rule. For had the Council meant what the Vindicator says, the Words must have run thus.

*Vel eas, aliaque sacra monumenta inutiliter honorari atque SANCTORUM opis impetrandæ causâ , EORUM memorias frustra frequentari.*

Or that those and other Sacred Monuments are unprofitably honoured ; and that for the obtaining of the Help of the *Saints*, *Their Memories* are in vain frequented.

The Relative *Eorum* had this way been determined to the Saints ; and so it had been placed, if that had been the meaning ; because otherwise *Eorum* would, according to the Rules of *Latin* Construction, fall to the share of *Monumenta* ; and this tho *Eorum* does by chance agree in Number and Gender with *Sanctorum* that comes afterward ; but which comes out of place there,

there, for *Eorum* to be referred to it, because this Relative had a very good Antecedent of its own before. This therefore I say, That he who Translates a *Latin* Sentence according to true *Latin* Construction, is no False Translator, but a True one; especially if that Sentence be part of a Work where the *Latin* is every where else very good, and that Sense which the Construction makes, agrees with all that is in connexion. And, 1. it agrees very well with the mention of *those many Benefits* which *Reliques* are said to be the Means of. And, 2. It holds with the Difference between the Matter of this Period, and that of the foregoing one, much better than the Vindicator's Sense does. For he would have the Help of the Saints to be mentioned here: But let him observe, that this was abundantly taken care for in the Provision that went immediately before; and therefore if it were Indifferent, as it is not, which way the Construction should be carried according to the use of *Latin*, this should carry it for ours, that here the Council was engaged in a new Matter, not for the *Invocation* of *Saints*, and the Benefits of that, which are provided for before; but for the *Veneration* of their *Reliques*, and the Benefits that come that way, which is the Business of this Period. And now the Vindicator may consider, to whom of right the Character of a *False Translator* belongs, of a *Falsifier*, and a *Calumniator* too.

Certainly Controversies about Religion were never disgraced by such mean Bickerings as these; but who can help it, that has to do with such Men as this Vindicator and his Friend the Representer?

So much for knowing the Sense of the Church by her Voice in her General and Approved Councils.

Again,

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

Pag. 6.

Again, We are to know what the Church delivers as a *necessary Practice*, by her *universally practising such things as necessary*. I ask therefore,

1. Did not the Church intend her Public Offices for Rules of *Universal Practice*? and are they not therefore one Means by which we are to judge of such Practice?

2. Whether those things are not *necessary* to be done in the *Roman Church*, which her Public Offices require?

3. Whether she does not practice those things as *necessary*, which she practises in conformity to her own Public Offices? or, Whether it be *indifferent* for the Children of the Church to observe her Rules, or to refuse to observe them?

The Vindicator understood himself to be liable to these Questions; and therefore when he comes to apply this Means of knowing the Churches Sense in necessary Practices, he adds a new Limitation. *Unless*, says he, *you can prove*, — *That what you term Old Popery was delivered as a Practice necessary TO SALVATION*, *all you say will avail you nothing*. For the Church is to answer for nothing which she requires not as *necessary to Salvation*. And tho' she obliges all her Children to worship the *Wood* on *Good-Friday*, and condemns those that refuse, as *Schismatics*, as *Imperitors* to his Cost; yet tis not the Churches Sense that they should do so, because the Rubric does not add that this is *Necessary to Salvation*. So that if the Church had commanded us to worship *Moloch*, that had not been *Popery* or the Churches Sense, unless she had inserted that Reason for her Command, That tis *necessary to Salvation* to worship *Moloch*.

In



In a word, The General Practice of the Church of Rome in the Service of the Virgin, the Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of Images, is notorious to the World. And no Man that knows the authorized Practice, can doubt of the Sense of the Church, nor be ignorant that in these things the Bishop of Meaux has delivered not the Churches Sense, but his own, if indeed it be his own. The Defender produced an Author of the Roman Communion, who concluded that the true and only Means to free their Religion from the Exceptions of Heretics, was to shew that it does not tolerate any thing but what is Good, and that the Public Worship, the Customs and Doctrines Authorized in it, are just and Holy. This Author had good Reason for what he said, especially against the Bishop of Meaux, who imputed to the Pagan Religion those Abuses which were publicly committed amongst them, and laughed at the Expositions of the Philosophers, that would put a good Sense upon their Abominable Worship. The Vindicator says, he admits the Parallel, but he is certain that it will never make any thing for us, till we can shew that the Church does or did make use of Racks and Gibbets, and all sorts of Tortures, to oblige People to believe and practise those things which we call Old Popery, as the Heathens did to make them worship Idols. That is to say, He does not admit the Parallel, tho he says he does admit it. For the Bishop of Meaux was brought in charging Paganism with all Barbarous and Idolatrous Worship, upon the account of their Notorious and Authorized Practices, without regard to their Cruelties upon those that refused to comply with them. And therefore if the Parallel be admitted, we may conclude an Old Popery from a like general Practice, without enquiring whether Racks and Gibbets, and

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

and all sorts of Tortures were used to enforce it upon the people.

But the Vindicator has required a wise condition to make the Parallel hold ; for he says in effect, that before Christianity appeared against Heathenism ; and till the Pagans had some people to hang and to torture, Paganism could not be charged with a Corrupt and Idolatrous Worship. And yet if this were necessary to be added, *Old Popery* has not been behind hand with the use of Racks and Gibbets and all sorts of Tortures ; to speak all in a word, it has had, and to this day it has an *Inquisition* to uphold it.

Fig. 7.

As for what he says that the Defender must shew, *that the Church allows such wicked Practices as correspond to his Authors example of Killing and Robbing, and are as dangerous to the Church, as those are to a State.* I reply, that the Question is not here, how dangerous those Doctrines and Practices are, which we call *Old Popery* ; but whether indeed they are to be charged upon the Church of *Rome*. And the Similitude was brought to shew, That it is to as little purpose to defend the Church of *Rome* against our exceptions, by pretending that no decision of Council can be produced requiring that Service and Worship, which is universally given to Saints and Images, as to acquit a City where they rob and kill without contradiction, by saying, that there is no Law commanding Men to rob and murder one another.

As for the danger of those Doctrines and Practices, which we call *Old Popery*, 'tis another Question, in which I am pretty confident, that *Good Man* the *Representer*, is bound to appear. He and the Vindicator therefore shall agree about it, at their leisure. I shall do my part to bring them fairly together, and so let

let them compound the matter betwixt them as well as they can.

The Vindicator felt himself born down with those clear Testimonies of an *Old Popery*, which the Defender plied him with; and by what appears now, he struggles at last with all his might, to make this same Popery, if so we must call it, to be not the Popery of the Church, but a Popery rather *in the Church*; and because 'tis of so large a Spread, and is manifestly upheld by the Authority of the Great Ones; therefore some good Words were now to be given it, to save the Reputation of the Church; which else, will be in great danger of the Similitude of a City that permits *to Rob and Kill without contradiction*; or rather of a City, that rewards Robbers, and punishes Honest men.

Wherefore says the Vindicator, *Every thing, I hope* Pag. 7.  
*that any one fancies to be ill, is not therefore to be reprov-*  
*ed.* And is it come to this at last? We had been in good hands, I see, if we had come into the Church of Rome upon the Representers Terms. For was it not the *Representer*, that said, *He would as soon be a TURK as the Answerers Papist*? Now the Answerers Papist was the *Old Papist*: And therefore it was notably and boldly said, That he would as soon be a *Turk as Our Papist*. For one would at least conclude from thence, that the Expounding and Representing Party would have stood stoutly by us, if we had come in rejecting all that *Popery*, as we used to call it, which the Representer had so bravely rejected. But if we had taken the Bait, had we not been finely angled up? For what says our Representer's other self, the Vindicator? Why truly, *Every thing, he hopes, that any one Fancies to be ill, is not therefore to be reprov-*ed. It seems then, that the Representer did but *fancy* those things

R

to

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

to be *ill*, which (not he in his misrepresenting side, but) the Answerer charged upon them as Popery : Or, shall we say, that these Men understand one another, and that he did not *fanſie* them to be ill, but for the present thought good to say however that they were monstrous ill things ; and that he would as soon be a *Turk* as the Answerers *Papist* ? But I rather think, they did not lay their Heads together upon this Business, but that in the desperate estate, to which the Vindicator's Cause was reduced, by the clear Testimonies of such a Popery amongst them, as the Representer rejects with detestation, he found himself obliged, for the credit of his Church, and perhaps for his own safety, to remit of his Rigour ; or rather to take off his Disguise a little, without asking the Representer's leave ; and so *he hopes that every thing that any one fanſies to be ill, is not therefore to be reprov'd.*

But the Representer has the less reason to be angry with our Vindicator, because this Gentleman has made as bold with himself, as with his Friend. The Vindicator too once *fanſied*, that it was an *ill* thing to *Worship the Image of our Saviour or the Holy Croſs with Divine Worship, upon any account whatsoever.* But Cardinal *Capisucchi* came in the way ; and so every thing that the Vindicator himself *fanſied to be ill, is not therefore to be reprov'd.*

Nay, he was not content to let the *Old Popery* get up again, but he has been pleas'd to sink the *New* one as much. For tho Cardinal *Capisucchi* says so and so, yet *seeing others of the same Communion reject this, and are NOT CENSURED BY THE CHURCH ; it plainly follows that his is not the necessary Doctrine of the Church. And what he says in this case is applicable to all others.* Alas for New Popery ! for it declines apace ;

we

we had thought it had been shewn us for the *True, Ancient, Standing Sence* of the Church. And now the most that can be said for it, is, that it is *not censured by the Church*. It seems then, that these Expounders and Representers, are but a *Tolerated Party*: One step more backwards, makes them not to be so much as *Tolerated*, and the next news we shall hear, is, that they are *Intolerable*. But, by the way, what Church does the Vindicator mean, by saying that he and his, are *not censured by the Church*? I answe he means, the *Invisible Church* which cannot now be seen, because no Council is sitting. The Fathers that sate at *Trent*, do not start out of their Graves to declare these Gentlemen *Heretically* inclined; and the *Books* of the Council do not rise up and fly in their Faces. For if we mind what the Authority of the now *Living, and Visible Church* declares in this case, we see that they who reject this *Old Popery*, as we call it, are *censured by the Church*: and, to mention *Imbert* no more, the instance of *Ægidius Magistralis*, Canon of *Sevil* in *Spain*, is a Conviction to the Vindicator of something that I will not name. For he was forced to abjure these two Propositions as *Heretical*. 1. *That the Images of Saints are not to be adored with the same Adoration with which the Prototypes are adored.* 2. *That the Cross is to be worshipped only with an Inferiour Adoration.* This very Instance being produced by the Defender out of *Capisucchi*, who left it for a *Caution* and a *Conviction* to such Men, as in good earnest maintain our Vindicators Doctrine; for the Vindicator to mention *Capisucchi's* Doctrine, and to say in the same breath, that they who reject it are *not censured by the Church*, is of a piece with his Sincerity every where else. Well, but let that pass, and let us consider what will come of this, if it be true, *that they are not censured by the Church.*

Pref. P. XIV.  
XV.

Really this is but a small encouragement to take Popery upon the Representer's Terms: For that which is *not now censured* by the Church, may in good time be *censured* by the Church. Perhaps you will say there is no reason to fear it: But in my mind there is; for, as I said before, the Credit of this *New Popery* has sunk extremely in a Month; for in truth the Vindicator has degraded it from being *Popery*, as we observed some time since. Now if it be not so much as *Popery*, it may in a little time grow to be *Heresie*, and then the Censures of the Church will follow as fast as can be: In the mean time, it is not *Popery*: And so farewell to the Representer's Undertakings, which are overthrown beyond all recovery; unless he faces about, and recovers his Credit, by beating the Vindicator out of the Field with his own Hand.

The Representer at first gave us a two-fold Character of Popery: One was of *That Popery which the Papists own and profess*, as appears in the Title Page of his First Part. In his very first Article of *Praying to Images*, the *Popery which the Papists own and profess* amounts to this, *That properly they do not so much as Honour Images, but only Christ and his Saints*. This is the *Popery* of the Representing side.

What now says the Vindicator? He very honestly acknowledges that there is a *private Sentiment* in the Church against this, that will have the *Image of Christ worshipped with the same Worship as Christ himself*; and what does he conclude upon it? Why, that *any one may hold which side they please as an Opinion, or suspend their Judgment, but neither side is truly what you ought to mean by Popery*. And therefore I conceive that if neither side be Popery, the Representers side is not Popery, but a private Opinion, which the Church has not yet *censured* as the Vindicator says. Now



Now what the Vindicator said in this Case, is applicable to all others; where the Answerer plainly shewed, that the Eminent and Leading Men of the R. Church were of a different *Sentiment* from the Representer. Whereas therefore the Representer either promised or threatned great matters in his Introduction: *I'll endeavour*, says he, *to separate these Calumnies and Scandals from what is REALLY THE FAITH AND DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.* I'll take off the Black and Dirt which has been thrown upon her, and set her forth in her GENUINE Complexion.— I'll Represent a Papist whose Faith and Exercise of his Religion is according to the Direction and Command of the Church: The Vindicator has on the other hand knocked him down at one blow: For, says he, *So long as the Church determines not the Dispute, any one may hold which side they please as an opinion, but neither side is truly what you ought to mean by Popery.*

This shews that I was not much out of the way, when I noted the great hazard of these Expounding and Representing designs. The truth is, it was so nice a work, that in prudence they ought to have committed it to one hand, and the Representer should have been the Vindicator. For while they are two, and and each of them driven to straits, one of them being pressed on one side, and the other on another side, the danger was great, that each of them would shift for himself a several way, and be exposed to the Reproaches of one another.

Thus it happened, that the Representer being pressed by his Adversaries, for not having fairly Represented Popery, was fain at last to make a Rule to know the Churches Sense by, which might serve his turn; and what should that be, but the *Current passing of his Book amongst*

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

amongst Catholics: for this, he thinks, was enough to shew, that the *Doctrine* of it was *Authentic*.

But the *Vindicator* being pressed with the Opposition that is made in the *Roman Communion*, to the *Doctrine* of the *Exposition*, and perceiving that *Current passing* would not serve his turn, he, I say, comes out a Month after the *Representer*, and will not allow any thing to make *Doctrine Authentic*, under the express *Words of a General Approved Council*; and he has utterly undone the poor *Representer's Rule of Current passing*, which he thought was enough to shew that his *Doctrine* was *Authentic*.

Nay, the unfortunate *Vindicator* has blown up the *Exposition* of the Bishop of *Meaux*, as well as the *Characters* of the *Representer*; which indeed could not be avoided, because one must necessarily follow the Fate of the other. For the Bishop's *Exposition* was solemnly pretended to be, *An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in Matters of Controversie*; that is to say, *An Exposition of Popery*. But the Bishop has expounded many things for the *Doctrine* of the *Catholic Church*, which other *Members of the same Church* condemn; and so long as the *Dispute* remains undetermined, neither *Side* is truly what you ought to call *Popery*. And therefore the Bishop should have called his Book *An Exposition of his own Private Sentiment concerning the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*: Thus, I say, he should have called it, or else he should have found out another *Vindicator*.

Nay, because the greatest Grace that his *Doctrine* seems now to have from the Church, is, That it is not censured by the Church: The Title should have been a little more wary, by running thus: *An Exposition of the Bishop's Private Sentiment, which the Church has not yet*

*yet censured, concerning the Doctrine of the Catholic Church.*

But because in truth the Living Church has begun to censure his Doctrine, and they who have censured it, are not censured for it: The Title should have been yet more warily contrived, thus: *An Exposition of the Bishop's Private Sentiment, which Sentiment is not contrary to the express Words of a General Approved Council.* Then perhaps the Vindicator might have done something in discharge of the Duty of a *Vindicator*. But as the case stands, he ought henceforward to change his Name, and to write himself the *Betrayer* of the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition, but by no means the *Vindicator* of it.

Which himself so well understood, that he thought fit to *pass over all the Letter* of the Defender to the Bishop; and he gives this substantial Reason for it; Because the Letter *concerns not him*, the Vindicator, nor the Doctrine of the Catholic Church which he is to vindicate. In good time! But the Letter sorely concerned the Bishop, and the Doctrine of his Exposition; Pag. 81. and therefore if it does *not concern* the Vindicator, you are not to wonder at it, because there have been great Changes of late, and now the Doctrine of the Bishop's Exposition is one thing, and the Doctrine of the Catholic Church is another.

I may without breach of Modesty say, that hitherto I have given the Vindicator a *Full Reply*. And I believe the Reader would be well satisfied that I should drop him here, and leave his following Cavils to be confuted by any one that will take the pains to compare him and the Defender together. But then this would be a Pretence for another Book, and for some boasting that he is not answered. A little therefore

fore must be said to what remains. And,

I. By many of the Roman Casuists allowing the *Defamation of an Adversary by false Accusations*, as the Defender said in his *Table*, it is so plain by the Book, that he meant no more than that they maintained it to be but a *Venial Sin*, that the Vindicator himself has not questioned it; and therefore it was a mere Cavil to tax the Defender of *Falsifying* in this business; tho to incourage the Vindicator to do well another time, thus much he is to be commended for, that he limited his Accusation to the expression of *Allowing*, which he found in the *Table*. *This, Sir, as you here word it, is a False Imputation*. Even where he does ill, I am glad that he does no worse. But to speak to the thing, They that make one of the basest things in nature to be but a *Venial Sin*, cannot reasonably be otherwise understood, than that they intend to make it easie for their own Party to commit it: And tho they flourish never so fairly with that Rule, that *No Evil is to be done that Good may come of it*; yet there are so many little ways amongst them of clearing themselves from Venial Sins, that when so foul a Wickedness is made but *Venial*, it can be with no other design than to encourage men to it; and I think I may put it to the Vindicator, whether an *Encouragement* to sin, be not equivalent to an *Allowance* of it. He grants the Pope condemned these Propositions, and seems to make some advantage of it, as if they were now never more to be told of them; because the *Supreme Pastor* has condemned them. But before he insinuates any such Conclusions again, I would desire him to inquire of *F. I. C.* what became of the Popes Brief to that purpose, in *France*; tho I believe there are some Fathers nearer hand that can inform him, if he knows it not already.

As

As for his endeavour to clear himself of denying what his Adversary proved upon this occasion, let him believe that he is come well off if he can : I will not pursue him as if it was hard to get him at an Advantage. Pag. 8.

2. He says the *Defender* far exceeds him in giving *Obliging Titles*, otherwise called Hard Words. The *Defender* put those together which he complained of, and they are a pretty Company. The *Vindicator* refers us to the *Defence* from Pag. 49 to 54. to shew how he has been used : I have read over those Pages, and I find the *Defender* there *preparing himself to encounter Rudeness and Incivility* Pag. 49. *esteeming it Unchristian to return his Adversaries Revilings*, Pag. 50. shewing in him the marks of a *Calumniating Spirit*, and that he is an *unfit Witness to be credited against* an Adversary, Pag. 51, &c. It seems he should have said that the *Vindicator* was a very Civil, Moderate, Fair-spoken and Honest Gentleman, that had abused no body. If we do not commend these Men, as much as they commend themselves, we must be thought to rail at them, as much as they do at us. For my own part, I have not *Complemented* the *Vindicator*, but I have spared him, and he ought to thank me for it ; tho I do not much care whether he does or no, unless withal he intends to deserve well for the time to come. Pag. 9.  
Def. Pag. 54,  
55.

3. To his Cavil at the *Defenders* arguing that the Bp. of *Meaux's* *We suppose*, or as the *Vindicator* renders him, *We believe*, or as the *French* may be rendred, *We esteem*, is *no Argument of the truth of that Doctrine*, which he so propounds : I reply, that the *Defender* did not thereupon infer, that the *Bishop* had no other Argument to produce. By the way, I tell the *Vindicator*, that he cannot produce a better for that Pag. 7.

Def. p. 57.

Doctrine that was in question. But for him to say, That the Defender *sees he cannot now deny that that was a Falsification*, tho in Truth he would not allow it so much as to be a *Mistake*, is to give us more and more reason to conclude that we must have done with these Men; for why should a Man under restraint, go on to argue with another that feels none?

To his other Cavil, that the Defender brings in the Bishop "observing that St. Paul concluded that Christ *himself ought not to be any more offered*, without putting in the following Words, *up to death for us*. I reply, that the Defender by *Offering*, meant *offering to death*, as he said in his last Defence, and that without such a Supposition *his Argument was lost*. But of this the Vindicator would take no notice. I add, that there was no need of repeating those Words that were omitted, because *Christ* was spoken of before as a *Victim offered for sin*. Nor was there any need of saying this, but that I do in my Conscience believe, that we have to do with such a Representer and a Vindicator, as are not this day to be matched within the Lines of Communication: If we go any further, I think I know of *One* that will set 'em hard.

4. For what concerns the Translation of the Bishops Letter, it was certainly but just in the Defender to answer Mr. *de Meaux's* Sense, and not his Translators Blunders. But now for that wise Remark which the Vindicator has made upon that Passage, *Pag. 11.* he had done much more prudently to have considered what the Defender told him, That really he is not Master enough of the *French* Language to pretend to turn *Critick* in it, than to have given the World so evident a Demonstration of it. Every one knows that is at all acquainted with that Tongue, that *Cartons* do not signifie  
in



in general *any Leaves*, but such Leaves as are put into the room of others that are taken out of a Book; and therefore to add *Cartons* to a Book, is as the Defender truly rendred it, to *take out some Leaves and put in others in the room of them.*

5. The Defender named those Accusations of the Vindicator against him, which he could not know to be true, and gave some Reasons for saying so. But the Vindicator charging the Defender with the like, has neither given one Reason, or so much as one Instance.

As for this Mans accusing the Defender, of things which he *knew to be evidently False*; the Defender instanced in the Vindicators charging him with *Falsifying Cajetan* upon the Question of *Extreme Unction*; tho it was most evident, that he had not falsified *Cajetan*, as he shewed in his Second Defence. Upon this the Vindicator declares in *the Presence of God*, — *the Avenger of all wilful Crimes*, That he never accused his Adversary of any thing, but what he thought (*may had proved*) him evidently guilty of: And he thinks he has now satisfied the World, that in that very instance, the Defender is a Falsifier. And for this he refers in the Margin to his Letter to the Author of the Discourse concerning *Extreme Unction*. Well, the first use I make of this, is to Adore the Mercy and Patience of the Great God to whom this Man has appealed: I lay no stress at present upon the *obvious* right in this matter; but as far as I can recollect, he could not but have seen that Authors Answer to his Letter, before this *Full Answer* of his came out of the Press. And then, the Lord have mercy upon him. One thing I am sure of, that he either wants that Conscience or that Understanding which are required to swearing in Truth and

Page 10.

Judgment, who can after such a Conviction, declare in the Presence of Almighty God, that he has proved the Defender a Falsifier of *Cajetan*.

Pag. 10.

6. As to his *Scandalous Reflections* upon the Church of *England*, he refers us for a proof of whatever he has said, to a late Book called *Good Advice to the Pulpits*; which if it does prove those things against us, which it pretends to do, does not yet justify one quarter of that Reviling which he has discharged against us. But whereas he says, that *Book alone is enough to make our Party ashamed*, I must tell him that his Boast is a little unseasonable, since his Party may have in a little time some cause to be ashamed of the Book; and the Vindicator in particular, for having boasted of it. I have a strong Fancie that the *Good Advice* is the *Representer's* own: But the Vindicator's good Words of it, will not, I guess, make amends for undoing the Representer in his main Chance.

7. For that Parallel which the Defender required to the account of things in *Q. Elizabeths* time, for which *Dr. Heylin* is quoted; this Man says no more than to this purpose, That if it were not for some *hot-headed Spirits*, these *brangles about Religion* might be ended. Which is as much as to say, that he insinuated something, which his Superiours have forbidden him to own. It seems that it was to be insinuated, but not spoken plainly. But because he forbears I shall do so too, and refer my self to the World, if he has not now made *Nonsense* of the Application of *Heylin's* Account.

8. As to his being a Spy upon the Defender, his Vindication of himself, is the very Master-piece of his Answer: For no Man that closely attends to his Words, can tell whether he denies or confesses it; tho to a Super-

Superficial Reader he seems to deny it. His Words are elaborately put together, and tho I am in very great haste, yet I must needs let the Reader see them. *If I reflected upon your preaching, it was from meer report* (but he might be at Church, when he did not reflect upon the Defenders preaching) *for I assure you, Sir, what you were told of my being sometimes a part of your Auditory, is like many other Stories which you abound with in all your Writings, I suppose too from hear-say.* But if the Defender were not told of it, but saw him at Church, then this comes not within the Case, because he had it not then from *Hear-say*, but from *Eye-sight*. Again, if the Defender were told of it, then indeed he had it from *Hear-say*, but he might hear the Truth for all that. The Vindicator was afraid of Proof, and I advise him to be so still. That which follows is just such another pleasant Strain; it concerns the *Sunday Night Conferences*; but the Reader shall go for that himself, as he likes the other.

But whereas upon this occasion of the Defenders Preaching, he bids him ask his Conscience, *Whether they who acknowledge only One God whom they must adore can be guilty of such a Horrid Crime, as to give Divine Worship to Saints?* I have asked the Defender about it, who has also asked his Conscience, and in the name of his Conscience, he says, That they *may be guilty of that Horrid Crime.* And more then that, he intends to give these Men such Reasons for his Conclusion, as he is in his Conscience persuaded, cannot be fairly answered. In the mean time, I will give the Vindicator a Question for his Question, and desire him to put it to his own Conscience, "Whether a Woman who acknowledges only one Husband,  
"to

"to whom she must pay Conjugal Duty, can be guilty of such a horrid Crime, as to give her Husband's Bed to another? And then let him use a little Conscience in the Application.

Pag. 11, 12.

9. For what next follows, That he would not be thought to have abused the Defender's *Auditory*; that the Defender had better give up the Cause; that he gave ill Language and justified it; that he believes every *idle Report* of the Bishop of *Meaux*, rather than his *Vindication*; and his explaining of the Word *Reveries*; this shall all pass off quietly.

Pag. 12.

10. And so should his next Reflexion too, but that he is so warm upon it, that he must not be neglected. The Defender had affirmed those Expressions of *St. Germane*, *St. Anselm*, and the rest of 'em, concerning the Virgin, which *Crasset* had transcribed, to be *horrid Blasphemies*. This the Vindicator could not endure. The Defender therefore transcribed them out of *Crasset*, and left the Reader to judge. What now says the Vindicator? Why truly he knew not well what to say: To confess plainly that they were *Blasphemies*, would be to vindicate the Defender: To deny it plainly, was yet a little too soon; for tho New Popery was drawing on, it had not yet breathed its last. He took a middle Course, and thus informs the Defender. *Had you only said that Father Crasset had collected such Passages from those great Saints, as if taken in that strict and dogmatical sense he brought them for, might be called Blasphemies, that Father must only have answered for them.* This Man has a notable Gift of Speaking, and saying nothing, which does him great service at a pinch. He does not say, That if those Passages were taken in that *strict and dogmatical sense* for which *Crasset* brought them, then they might be

be called *Blasphemies*; for this had been to bring Father *Crasset* upon his back, with all those great Saints, which *Crasset* had already raised up against *Widenfelt*. And yet he does not say, That if the Defender *had said* what he supposes for him, that Father *Crasset* could have brought himself off: No, he answers more warily, That *that Father must only have answered for them*; which, it may be, he could, and it may be, he could not. Now here he should have ended: For *Crasset* may take himself to be sacrificed in what follows. *But to lay them to those Holy Saints Charges, to call them Superstitious Men, their Expressions horrid Blasphemies,—is what truly pious Ears cannot hear without Indignation.* For Father *Crasset* is in an ill case, if to lay the Holy Saints Expressions in *Crasset's* sense, to the charge of the Holy Saints, be what *truly pious Ears cannot hear without Indignation.* But I beg the Vindicator's Pardon; for now I see how *Crasset* may be brought off again, or rather the Vindicator. For perhaps that *which pious Ears cannot hear*, is not every Particular by it self, but altogether; *i. e. pious Ears* may hear those Passages laid to the charges of the Saints, even in *Crasset's* sense; but that therefore those Saints should be called *Superstitious Men*, and their Expressions *Horrid Blasphemies*, as they were, not by *Crasset*, but by the Defender; this is what *truly pious Ears cannot hear without Indignation.*

Now after all this dexterity, he has not offered to shew that those Passages which the Defender produced are not *horrid Blasphemies*, or that they are capable of a good sense. If the Reader has forgot them, he may go to the Defender for them, *p. 89, 90, &c.* and then he will be satisfied that all this shuffling comes to no more than this; that the Vindicator cannot bear any thing

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

thing that reflects dishonourably upon his *Great and Holy Saints*; but his *pious Ears* can hear Expressions from them that do *blasphemously* reflect upon *Almighty God*, without any *Indignation* at all.

11. The Defender produced those *Prayers and Ceremonies* in the *Consecration of a Cross*, which to him seemed to be *Magical Incantations* rather than *Prayers*. The Vindicator, to be even with him, says, That we *use the like Prayers and Ceremonies in the Consecration of Churches and Chappels*. Now if we do, then I for my part will say, That our *Prayers* upon that Occasion look more like *Magical Incantations* than *Prayers*. But why did not the Vindicator produce the *like Prayers* to those which the Defender produced? Will any Man think that his good Nature would not suffer him to shame us so grievously? Or does the Vindicator think that he is of such Credit, that his Word must be taken for any thing he says? He refers indeed to *Sparrow's Collection of Canons*, p. 375. But why not a few Lines transcribed from thence, to match the Defender's particular Allegations? Even because the Place would not afford them. I grant, that we set Persons and Places too apart for the Service of our Maker, by Prayer and Ceremony. But do we pray that the *Stones of the Church* may be a *saving Remedy to Mankind*, as they do that the *Wood of the Cross* may be so? Do we pretend to derive any Virtue upon them, which is afterwards to be derived from them; or that by the Holiness of our Churches we may be *redeemed from Sin*, as they hope to be by the *Merits* of a *Consecrated Cross*; for so they pray at the *Consecration* of it? This, and the like, is that which seems to be *Magical Incantation*: But for which he cannot find an appearance of a Parallel amongst us,  
any



any more than he could for that sort of Conjuring, which they call *Exorcising*, and for which he has said never a word; and it had not been the worse for him, if he had said as little for the *pious and significant Ceremonies* of his Church in the Consecration of *Crosses*.

12. He says, *The Guide in Controversie* remains unanswered. To which I shall not think it enough to say what he does to the Catalogue of our unanswered Books, That *he should have told us whether 'tis worth answering in particular or no, when all that is said in it, is obviated in many Treatises*; tho I am very confident that this is the very Truth. But I shall add, 1. That some Parts of the *Guide in Controversie* have been answered, and the very Foundations of it overthrown, in *Dr. Stillingfleet's Second Discourse in Vindication of the Protestant Grounds of Faith, &c. in answer to the Guide in Controversies* by R. H. Imprimatur Sam. Parker. April 15. 1673. Again, the Fourth Discourse in the Second Edition set forth 1673, is answered in *The Difference between the Protestant and Socinian Methods*, published about a Year since. And the Fifth Discourse in Vindication of the Council of Trent, was answered in the Second Part of the *Necessity of Reformation*. To which we have had no Return. And we think our selves to be upon equal Terms at least with our Adversaries, as to this very Book. But, 2. For what wants a particular Answer, I am apt to think that this unseasonable Boast of the Vindicator will prove an Occasion of depriving his Party even of that little thing they have to say in this kind; and therefore they will tell him, I doubt, that he mentioned it a little too soon. For what he says, *That they may be attacked as the other Discourses of the same*

T

Author

*A Reply to the Vindicator's Full Answer.*

*Author lately published at Oxford, with the like Misfortune :* I reply, That hitherto the Answers have had the fortune to remain without any Returns ; which if it be a *Misfortune* to the Authors, 'tis for this only Reason that I can think of, That the oftner our Adversaries write in the way of Replies and Answers, the more they discover their own Nakedness, as I am pretty sure the Representer and the Vindicator have done for their parts.

---

THE END.

---

